

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1.

NOVEMBER, 1889.

No. 2.

THE POSITION OF WOMEN AMONG THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

BY J. DONALDSON, LL.D., SENIOR PRINCIPAL, UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S.

From The Contemporary Review (London), September, 1889

AT the outset of this article I wish to forewarn my readers that probably many of them will be greatly disappointed by the results of my investigations. It is a prevalent opinion that woman owes her present high position to Christianity, and the influences of the Teutonic mind. I used to believe this opinion, but in the first three centuries I have not been able to see that Christianity had any favourable effect on the position of women, but, on the contrary, that it tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity. Unquestionably in the Gospels women occupy a prominent position. Many of them followed Christ and ministered to Him. With a woman who had had five husbands and was living with a man not her husband, He holds the most profound conversation, and to her He proclaims the grandest truths of His revelation. And the women of His day and country seem to have had great liberty of movement and action. One of them, described by St. Luke as "a sinner in the city," finds her way into the house of a Pharisee with whom He was dining, pours a box of ointment on His feet, and washes His feet with the hair of her head. Christ mingles freely in the marriage festivities where His mother and doubtless other female relatives were present. His intercourse with the family of Bethany is of the most unrestrained character, and He talks to both sisters on the highest subjects. And, according to St. John, His first appearance after His resurrection is made to a woman, Mary of Magdala, from whom He had expelled seven demons. But in the Gospels there is no special doctrine propounded in regard to women, and if there

is any approach to this, it exhibits great mildness, if we take the story of the woman caught in adultery as genuine. It is when we come to the writings of St. Paul that opinions are pronounced in regard to marriage and the conduct of women, and there can be no doubt that these opinions are of a stern and restrictive nature. The Ebionites explained the Apostle's conversion by stating that he was, as he himself allowed, a native of Tarsus, that he was not a Jew, but a Greek with a Greek father and a Greek mother, that he went up to Jerusalem and stayed there for some time, that he fell in love with the high priest's daughter, became in consequence a proselyte and asked her in marriage, but on being refused he was enraged, and wrote against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the law. Some have thought that there is a bitterness against women in the writings of St. Paul which can be explained only by some such rejection as that related by the Ebionites. His words had a great influence on the formation of opinion in regard to women in the ancient Church. They fell in with the tendencies of the times, and were made the groundwork and support of the depreciation of marriage, which became prevalent in the third and fourth centuries of our era.

Christianity also soon brought with it a new state of feeling in regard to questions relating to sex. Acts that had been indifferent now became morally wrong, and the Christian writers inquire minutely into points which had not previously been discussed. The Christian writers are particularly frank in their treatment of these questions. Their sense of decency is quite different from that of the moderns, and the

consequence is that it is not possible for a modern writer to give a full exposition of their ideas and reasonings.

There are two Christian books belonging, the one to the beginning of the third century, the other to the beginning of the fourth, that make large reference to the duties and position of women. The first is the "*Pædagogus*," or Instructor, of Clement of Alexandria. In this work the Alexandrian Father guides the Christian in all the affairs of common life. He exhibits how the Christian ought to behave at meals, what food and drink he ought to take, how long he should sleep, what kind of clothes he ought to wear, how he ought to conduct himself in church, and similar matters. Now in dealing with the duties of women he refuses to employ any euphemism. A spade with him must be a spade or it is a lie. God created man and woman, every part of them, and "no one," he says, "ought to be ashamed of naming what God was not ashamed to create," and to go about the bush is to act in disrespect of Him. Besides, he thought it very important that every detail of the Christian life should be directed according to the instructions of Divine Reason, and therefore he would have regarded it a dereliction of duty if he had not discussed all that concerns the functions of women. But the feeling of the present age is for euphemism and concealment, and accordingly when we had to translate Clement's works into English, in the Ante-Nicene Library, there were portions so completely opposed to modern ideas of decency that we considered it better to present them in a Latin and not an English dress. The same peculiarity characterizes the other work which I mentioned—"The Banquet of the Ten Virgins," by Methodius. In this book ten virgins praise virginity; but the virgins show a remarkably intimate acquaintance with the physiology and aberrations of women. Now in the case of Clement no one can doubt the purity and simplicity of his mind, and his expositions, though they have been denounced by some divines, are absolutely devoid of all prurency. Perhaps there is a little of the meretricious in the style of the Banquet, for the writer is imitating somewhat unsuccessfully the Banquet of Plato; but the language is entirely consistent with perfect purity, and the difference from our own times is to be attributed to the sentiments of the age, not to a debasement of character.

There is another remark that has to be made before we proceed with our subject. We may have to employ the term Christi-

anity frequently; but a great mistake would be committed if it were assumed that the term has always the same meaning. There is the Christianity of Christ, the Christianity of the first century, the Christianity of Hildebrand, of Luther, and of Calvin. Christianity is different as it appears in different ages and persons. In the early centuries the Christianity of Rome differed from that of Greece and of Africa, and it is not to be assumed that, because one Christian writer mentions a practice, that practice was therefore universal in the Church. So when we quote a writer, that writer is of good authority for his own opinion or practice, of tolerably good authority for the doctrine and practice of the Christianity of his own country and age, but more faintly for the Christianity of other countries and ages.

At the time when Christianity dawned on the world, women had attained, as we have seen in our articles on Roman women, great freedom, power and influence in the Roman Empire. Tradition was in favor of restriction, but by a concurrence of circumstances women had been liberated from the enslaving fetters of the old legal forms, and they enjoyed freedom of intercourse in society; they walked and drove in the public thoroughfares with veils that did not conceal their faces, they dined in the company of men, they studied literature and philosophy, they took part in political movements, they were allowed to defend their own law cases if they liked, and they helped their husbands in the government of provinces and the writing of books. One would have imagined that Christianity would have favoured the extension of woman's freedom. For Christianity itself was one of the most daring revolutions which the world has ever seen. It defied all past customs, it aimed at the overthrow of the religions of the world, it overleapt the barriers of nationality, and it desired to fuse all mankind into one family and one faith. Necessarily, such a movement was accompanied by much excitement and agitation, but when enthusiasm sways any association of men, and they live in a state of ferment, they break in pieces the bonds of custom—those very bonds which most firmly chain women down to a slavish position of routine. Accordingly, at the very first stage women take a prominent part. But in a short time this state of matters ceases in the Church, and women are seen only in two capacities—as martyrs and as deaconesses.

As martyrs they presented a magnificent spectacle of what poor weak woman can dare and do when under the impulse of an

inspiring faith. There are especially two genuine Ante-Nicene writings which relate the courage of women under the agonies of trial. The first is the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and the second narrates the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas in the beginning of the third century. In the letter of the Church of Lyons the most conspicuous woman is a delicate young slave of the name of Blandina, to whom every possible kind of torture was applied, until her body was a mass of deformity, but no word could be wrung out of her in denial of her Lord. "I am a Christian," she said, "and there is no evil done amongst us." The torturers, finding her resolution immovable, allowed her a short respite. After an interval of a day or two she was taken to the amphitheatre to be exposed to the wild beasts. She was suspended upon a cross in the midst of these animals, but they did not touch her, and she was conveyed back to the noisome and dark dungeons of her prison. Neither wild beast nor prison altered her determination. The magistrates were very anxious that she should recant, and day by day they led her to the scenes of torture, in the hope that she would be frightened by the terrible sufferings which she saw her companions endure, and on each occasion they urged her to swear by the gods. Blandina remained steadfast, and on the last day of the gladiatorial shows she was taken to the amphitheatre. There she was scourged and roasted on a red-hot iron chair, then enclosed in a net and tossed by a bull, and finally stabbed, triumphant in the faith of a glorious resurrection and a blessed union with her Lord. The martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas was carried out in similar circumstances. Felicitas was a slave. Vivian Perpetua belonged to the higher ranks. She had received a good education, and was married at the time of her apprehension, and had a child at the breast. She was only twenty-two years of age. Her father was still a heathen, and urged her by every possible form of argument and appeal to renounce her faith, but she was firm. She was then cast into a dungeon and suffered agonies on account of the darkness and separation from her child. But her friends were influential enough to procure an alleviation of her hardships, and she was permitted to have her infant and to receive visits from her Christian brethren. After some days the prisoners were taken to the town hall and tried. Perpetua's father again assailed her with entreaties to swear by the gods, and so did the Roman

procurator. "Spare," said the latter, "the grey hairs of your father, spare the infancy of your boy, offer sacrifice for the well-being of the emperors." But Perpetua was unmoved, and to the fatal question "Are you a Christian?" she replied "I am a Christian," and was condemned to the wild beasts. She returned to her dungeon, there to await the day of the games. On that day the various prisoners were conveyed to the amphitheatre, and when the turn of the young women came, Felicitas and Perpetua were placed in nets and exposed to the attacks of a mad cow. Perpetua was first tossed up in the air and fell on her loins, but was not injured so much as to be unable to help Felicitas when she was crushed to the ground, for she gave her hand to her companion and lifted her up. The savage fury of the populace was appeased for a time, and a demand was made for other combatants. As the evening drew on, all the Christians alive were summoned to receive the final sword-thrust; they kissed each other and then submitted to their fate. Then the writer of the narrative exclaims, "O most brave and blessed martyrs, O truly called and chosen unto the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Every honour was heaped after death on the women who thus suffered for Christ's sake, and their ashes and other relics were supposed to exercise a sanctifying and miraculous influence; but during their lives it was their duty to stay at home and manage the affairs of their household and not meddle in teaching or any spiritual function.

Let us look now at the organization of the church. Various ideas are entertained in regard to this subject. The view that I take of it is that the organization was the outcome of the necessities of the case directed by the institutions of the age and the place. The idea that regulated the forms of organization was that each member should contribute to the Church, in an orderly way, any gift that God had given him. And, in the first enthusiasm of the Christian movement, women were allowed to do whatever they were fitted to do. Accordingly, we meet in the early Church with prophetesses. Special mention is made of the four daughters of Philip. The women combine with the men in spreading the Gospel. St. Paul calls several of them his fellow-labourers, and one he designates a minister or deaconess (as some have translated it) of the Church in Cenchreæ. But not many generations elapse when all this comes to an end, and we hear only of two classes of women in connection with the administra-

tion of Church affairs. The first is that of widows. The Church supported its own poor, and took upon itself especially the maintenance of widows and orphans. For the widows work was found. Some persons were required to visit sick women, to convey assistance to poor women, and to rear orphan children. Widows were selected for this service, but not all widows. Certain qualifications were deemed essential. The widow must at least be sixty years of age; she must have made up her mind not to marry again, and she must have experience in the nursing of children, so as to give suitable advice to mothers in their distress and difficulties. And, of course, she must have a good character for sobriety, discretion, and piety. In process of time the duties which had been assigned to them were transferred to another class of women, though the widows still continued to exist as a separate body. This new class received the name of deaconesses. Some have thought that deaconesses existed in the apostolic times, and others have supposed that the office was of early origin but confined to special localities. It seems to me that the passages on which these opinions have been based do not substantiate a fixed and definite office, but mere casual and sporadic services. It is towards the middle of the third century that in all probability the new order became common in all the Churches, for then the circumstances were such as to demand its existence. First of all, widowhood had fallen in the spiritual market and virginity had risen. It was not wrong for the widow to have married, but the act implied a certain weakness, and she thereby contracted a stain which rendered her less fit for the service of the Church. Accordingly, even in the time of Tertullian, virgins were elected for the duties and called widows. "I know plainly,"* he says, "that in a certain place a virgin of less than twenty years of age has been placed in the order of widows." He himself objects in the strongest manner to this innovation, and speaks of this virgin as a monster—a virgin-widow, and unfit for the work, because she had not had experience in the married life and in the training of children. But the respect for virginity was at that time growing, and other circumstances combined to evoke the new order. To the end of the second century there were no public buildings for Christian worship. The Christians met in private houses, and the tenants of the houses made all the arrangements necessary

for the meetings. But when churches began to be built, officials had to look after them, and this duty was assigned to the deacons. In the advance of ascetic ideas, the women sat or stood apart from the men and entered by a separate door. And at this door stood the deaconess to direct the worshippers to their places and to see that all behaved quietly and reverently. This was the great work of women in the Church, and in the end became nearly their only work. But they had also to help the deacons in any service which was deemed more suitable for women. Thus, in baptism, the women were immersed, but it was not seemly that all the preparations for the ceremonial should be made by the men, and the dressing and undressing were committed to the care of the deaconess. At the same rite the deacon anointed only the forehead of the Christian woman with oil; the deaconess then anointed her whole body. The deaconess also undertook the work which the widows had done in carrying messages and ministering to the temporal wants of poor women. "Thou shalt send a woman a deaconess, on account of the imaginations of the bad," is the order given in the Apostolical Constitutions.

The widows had no spiritual function. They were not to teach. How jealous the Church was in this matter is seen from the instructions given to them: "Let the widow," is the commandment in the Constitutions, "mind nothing but to pray for those that give and for the whole Church, and when she is asked anything by any one let her not easily answer, excepting questions concerning the faith and righteousness and hope in God. . . . But of the remaining doctrines let her not answer anything rashly, lest by saying anything unlearnedly she should make the word to be blasphemed." And the occupation of the widow is summed up in these words, "She is to sit at home, sing, pray, read, watch and fast, speak to God continually in songs and hymns." And if she wishes to go to any one to eat or drink with him, or to receive anything from any one, she must first ask the deacon's consent, and if she acts without first consulting him she is to be punished with fasting or separated on account of her rashness.

The deaconesses also were prohibited from teaching. They were superior to the widows in the liberty of movement which they had, and the widows were enjoined to be obedient to them; but they had no spiritual function, and while there is no doubt that they were ordained for their service, as the widows also were, they had no sacred char-

* All the translations are taken from Clark's Ante-Nicene Library.

acter, and could perform no priestly office. To take one instance from Tertullian. In discussing the administration of baptism, he states that the bishop has the right of conferring it first of all, then presbyters and deacons, and then if none of these are at hand, a layman might administer, but a woman never. And he appeals to the Apostle Paul. "For how credible would it seem that he who has not permitted a woman even to *learn* with over-boldness, should give a female the power of teaching and baptizing. 'Let them be silent,' he says, 'and at home consult their own husbands.'"

The entire exclusion of women from every sacred function stands in striking contrast with both heathen and heretical practice. In Rome the wife of the Pontifex Maximus took the lead in the worship of Bona Dea, and in the religious rites which specially concerned women. The most honoured priest attached to a particular god in Rome, the Flamen Dialis, must be married, and must resign his office when his wife died, for his wife was also a priestess, and his family were consecrated to the service of the god. And the vestal virgins received every mark of respect that could be bestowed on them, and the amplest liberty. The highest officials made way for them as they passed along the streets, they banqueted with the College of Pontifices, they viewed the games in the company of the Empress, and statues were erected in their honour. The same respect is accorded to women by many of the heretical Christians. Nearly every founder of a sect has a woman to aid him. Simon Magus has his Helena, Montanus his Maximilla, Apelles his Philumene, and so in the case of other sects. One sect deserves special notice for the energy with which it supported the claims of women. It bore various names, such as the Quintiliani, the Pepuziani, the Priscilliani, and the Bread-and-Cheesites, because they celebrated their mysteries with bread and cheese. They gave special thanks to Eve because she first ate of the tree of knowledge. They celebrated the sister of Moses and the four daughters of Philip, because they asserted the right of women to prophecy, that is, to speak in public the message of God. Frequently in their church seven virgins, clothed in white and bearing torches, stood up and addressed the people, and spoke so eloquently that tears of repentance ran down the cheeks of the audience. In this sect women held the place of bishops and elders and deacons as well as men, and they appealed to St. Paul for their practice: for he says, "In Christ Jesus there is

neither male nor female." It is against this sect that Tertullian, or one assuming his name, launches his thunderbolts. "The very women," he says, "of these heretics how wanton they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures, it may be even to baptize."

Such, then, was the position which women occupied in the Church in the course of the first three centuries of Christianity. The highest post to which she rose was to be a door-keeper and a message-woman, and even these functions were taken away from her during the Middle Ages. Was there a reason for this? Perhaps we may find some clue to this phenomenon in the conceptions which the Fathers of the Church formed of the nature of woman.

It is one of the curious features of early Christianity that it did not discuss some of those social problems which would naturally have suggested themselves. Thus no objection is taken to slavery, though the Therapeutæ had already denounced it as unlawful and inhuman. Christianity proclaimed a gospel of love, which had no limit but that of the human race. And it applied this gospel to all classes. The Christian slave thus became the brother of all members of the community, received kindness from all and was admitted to equal rights and privileges. But Christianity also enjoined on him submission to the will of his proprietor, urging the belief that man is bound to be content with the position in which he is, to bear patiently all the ills of this life in the certain hope of a glorious future. The marriage laws and customs prevalent throughout the Roman world in the first ages of Christianity ought to have created difficulty, but nothing is said of this difficulty. Thus a Christian slave woman was the property of her master, her children were a source of gain to him, and he took entire control over this matter, as over the breeding of cattle. Yet we do not hear of any discussion in regard to this arrangement, nor of any attempt to rescue the slave woman from the treatment to which she must have been subjected. Again, the Roman law recognized marriages only between citizen and citizen; but a very large number of the early Christians had not the rights of citizenship until the beginning of the third century, and if they made associations of the nature of marriage, their children were deemed illegitimate by the civil law. Probably the Church defied the civil law. It became a maxim that Christians were not to go to law with each other, and

the Church established laws, and a jurisdiction of its own. In the case of marriage this was peculiarly necessary, as the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever caused to the former great inconvenience in carrying out his faith, and indeed supplied strong temptations to apostasy. Such marriages were therefore from the first forbidden on pain of expulsion. It is likely, then, that any Christian man and woman were regarded as duly married, notwithstanding the civil law, if they had got the consent of the bishop; and secret connections—that is, connections not first professed in the presence of the Church—were considered akin to vice.

The questions that occupied the Christian mind related rather to the moral character of marriage. These questions were raised first of all by the heretical sects, which applied philosophy to the tenets and practice of the Church. And it is one of the most interesting facts in early Christian history that the Church in combating these sects succeeded in defeating them, but always carried off a large portion of their heretical opinions for its own permanent use. The sects may be divided into two classes. Some affirmed that marriage was unnecessary, that full liberty had been conceded to them of indulging the passions, and that indeed the way to rise to perfection was by a practical acquaintance with all forms of action possible to man. Others held that marriage was immoral, that the flesh was corrupt, that those who sowed to the flesh must reap corruption, and that in the kingdom of God on earth as in heaven there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage. It is difficult to trust all that is said about these heretical sects—for our accounts are derived from the orthodox alone—and in regard to this matter of marriage the orthodox invariably accuse the heterodox of licentiousness. But there was no class of people who ought to have been more careful in their assertions than the orthodox, as they themselves were accused of the vilest crimes. It is one of the most striking facts in all history that in the second century the Christians were universally believed by Pagans to be secret conspirators combined for immoral purposes, and at their trials it was sufficient for a man to confess that he was a Christian to be condemned as a licentious villain. The assertions made in regard to them were that they met in secret, that slaughtering an infant they poured his blood into a cup, and that passing this cup round they all drank of it; that then the lights were extinguished and the men and women proceeded to indis-

criminate licentiousness. How could such ideas have arisen? An explanation of this reveals to us marked peculiarities of the early Church in the treatment of women, and may help us to see how the later opinions arose. Christianity came at first in the fervour of an overpowering love, love to God and love to man, irrespective of his race, position, or belief. But this fervour of love directed itself with special force to those who accepted the same faith. They called each other fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, brothers and sisters. They were in the habit of assembling before dawn, or at night, men and women together, in private houses to conduct their worship. The assembly consisted of a strange assortment of characters and grades. The Apostle Paul in writing to the Corinthian Church says to them: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor cheats, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor plunderers, shall inherit the kingdom of God: and these things were some of you." And there were in the assembly the bond and the free, the rich and the poor, the high and low, but with a large preponderance of the low. It was natural for a heathen to suppose that an assembly, composed, as he would consider it, of the dregs of society, and meeting in hours of darkness, had no good object in view. And the account which they themselves gave of their worship sounded to a Pagan equally contemptible. The Christians affirmed that they worshipped a poor carpenter, a son of despised Galilee, the child of a husbandless mother. Then they spoke of eating a body and drinking blood. But perhaps colour was given to the accusation, most of all by two institutions which have now passed away, except in the case of one or two small sects.

In the days of the first fervour the Christian brethren set up a plan of voluntary socialism, and wished to have all things in common; but the plan did not work, and they had recourse to a systematic relief of the poor. One feature of this relief was what were called Love-feasts. It was not unusual in ancient times for large bodies of men to dine together, and large dinner parties were often made up by each man bringing his contribution to the feast. With some such idea as this the Christians met, men and women together, the rich bringing the supplies, and they all dined together. Probably they did this every day at the earliest period, and some think that these meals constituted the celebration of what is

called the Lord's Supper. The love-feasts were unquestionably associated with this institution, but in the course of time they became less frequent, and generally took place after the administration of the Eucharist. They continued till the fifth century, at least, and were often held in the churches, after churches were erected. These dinners were not always scenes of perfect propriety, as St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians shows, and on some occasions intoxication and riotousness prevailed. These feasts went by the name of Loves, or Love-feasts, as we now translate the word. We need not wonder that Pagans should suspect that the Loves were not of the purest.

Then there was another practice, still more foreign to our Christian ideas. There is no command in the New Testament to keep the Sunday, or to stand or sit at singing, or to repeat the Creed or to keep Good Friday or Christmas, or to do a hundred other things about which Christians have wrangled with all earnestness; but there is a commandment five times repeated in the Apostolic Epistles, and indicative of the strong bond of brotherhood which bound Christian brothers and sisters to each other, to this effect: "Salute the brethren with a holy kiss," St. Peter varying the command, "Salute the brethren with a kiss of love." It is likely that at first this kiss was imparted at every meeting, but gradually it became limited to the great sacramental occasions, such as baptism and the Eucharist. At first, too, and for a considerable time, the Christian brothers and sisters kissed each other. It is easy to see that such a practice would give rise to scandalous reports, and there is evidence in the ecclesiastical writers that the early Christians did not always make it a holy kiss, as it should have been. Athenagoras quotes a saying which he attributes to our Lord, and which evidently deals with an abuse of this practice. It is to this effect: "Whoever kisses a second time, because he has found pleasure in it, commits a sin." And Clement of Alexandria thus speaks of the matter: "Love is not tested by a kiss, but by kindly feeling. But there are those that do nothing but make the churches resound with a kiss. For this very thing, the shameless use of the kiss, which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports."

These customs prove that considerable freedom prevailed among the earliest Christians, and doubtless sometimes this freedom was abused. In the very first epoch some of the Corinthian Christians sided with a man who committed incest and persisted in

it after rebuke, and the Apostle had to exert himself to the utmost to repress the sympathy and the sin. But the accusations, speaking generally, were hideously false and unfounded. They are of some consequence for our purpose, for they must have acted powerfully on the minds of Christians in inducing them to avoid everything that might furnish even the semblance of justification for them.

From a very early date two currents can be traced in the Church—one in the direction of upholding marriage, another in that of despising and rejecting it. No one with the New Testament as his guide could venture to assert that marriage was wrong, and the tradition remained firm in the Church during the Ante-Nicene period that it was unlawful and heretical to forbid marriage. The Apostolic Fathers offer exhortations to wives to love their own husbands truly, and to love all others with no partiality for any one and in all chastity, and to train up their children in the knowledge and fear of God. As time moves on, such exhortations become less frequent, but still marriage is held up as a modified blessing. And Tertullian, whose words in an opposite direction are very strong and numerous, has this passage, "Whence are we to find language adequate to describe the happiness of that marriage which the Church cements and the oblation confirms, and the benediction signs and seals, which angels report and the Father holds as ratified?" And then he describes the joys of the couple: "Together they pray, together prostrate themselves, together perform their fasts, mutually teaching, mutually exhorting, mutually sustaining." But Tertullian, it has to be noticed, is not here insisting on the blessings of marriage, but on the blessedness of a marriage between two believers celebrated in the face of the Church, in contrast with a marriage between a believer and an unbeliever not sanctioned by the Church. The duties of the wife were simple: She had to obey her husband, for he was her head, her lord and superior; she was to fear him, reverence him, and please him alone; she had to cultivate silence; she had to spin and take care of the house, and she ought to stay at home and attend to her children. The only occasions for her going out were when she went to church, or with her husband to visit a sick brother.

The other current of thought which I mentioned ran against marriage, and it was of an ascetic nature. The seeds of it occur in the "Republic" of Plato, and it attached itself to the Pauline conception of flesh. I

can explain it best by a reference to food. We take food in order to sustain the body. But various kinds of dainties please the palate, and we may take the food not merely for health, but for the pleasure that it gives. In the first instance we are acting rightly and under an irresistible necessity. In the second instance we are sinning, for we are yielding to a base appetite, the outcome of the flesh. The flesh, its appetites and passions, are the sources of human corruption, and gratification of the flesh is a sin. In like manner the sole object of marriage is that children may be born, and if any other object is sought, it is a gratification of lust, and therefore while marriage is allowable, man may be nearly as licentious in marriage as out of it. These inferences are drawn with the utmost precision by Christian writers of the second and third centuries, and the opinions I have mentioned will be found expressed in numerous passages. But it is easy to see that the mind could not halt in this position. Marriage, even for the sake of children, was a carnal indulgence, and such thinkers could not help feeling that the arrangement of the Creator was not altogether satisfactory. They did not venture on saying this. They did not dare to condemn marriage. But they held that it was much better not to marry at all, that the man or woman who had never married, but remained pure, was a nobler and more exalted being than the man or woman who had married. Of course these ideas did not spring into vogue at once, but gradually forced their way. They were aided by the increasing rigour in the distinction between clerical and lay. The clerical man must possess a peculiar sanctity. A man who aspired to a clerical office in the church must, above all, show control over the lusts and passions of earth, and so refrain from marriage. The lay brother might be unable to free himself from the trammels of earth; the cleric could rise to the throne of heaven only on the wings of virginity. There thus arose a gradation of merit which had its counterpart in the evolution of the world's history. "For the world," says Methodius, "while still unfilled with men, was like a child, and it was necessary that it should first be filled with these, and so grow to manhood. But when hereafter it was colonized from end to end, the race of man spreading to a boundless extent, God no longer allowed man to remain in the same ways, considering how they might now proceed from one point to another and advance nearer to heaven until, having attained to the very greatest and

most exalted lesson of virginity, they should reach to perfection, that first they should abandon the intermarriage of brothers and sisters and marry wives from other families, and then that they no longer should have many wives, like brute beasts, as though born for the mere propagation of the species, and then that they should not be adulterers, and then that they should go on to continence, and from continence to virginity, when having trained themselves to despise the flesh, they sail fearlessly into the peaceful haven of immortality." Marriage, according to this writer, was not abolished by Christ, but it was a state of inferiority. "For I think," he makes a virgin say, "I have gathered clearly from the Scriptures that after the Word had brought in virginity, He did not altogether abolish the generation of children; for though the moon may be greater than the stars, the light of the other stars is not destroyed by the moonlight." There thus arose the gradation of virgins, widows, and wives. Tertullian speaks of wives as women of the second degree of modesty who have fallen into wedlock.

The current of thought which I have exhibited displays itself, first of all, in the condemnation of second marriages. The Apostle Paul permitted these, and the Church could not forbid them. In the Pastor of Hermas they are not condemned, but Athenagoras raises his voice against them. "He who deprives himself," he says, "of his first wife, even though she be dead, is a cloaked adulterer." The argument used against them was that God made husband and wife one flesh, and one flesh they remained, even after the death of one of them. If they were one flesh, how could a second woman be added to them? She could not become *one* flesh. Tertullian, diverging from the Catholic to the Montanistic faith, maintained that a second marriage was equal to a marriage with two wives at one time, and therefore forbidden. But whatever their arguments were, at the root of the opinion lay the ascetic tendency of thought. This is seen in Tertullian, who wrote a treatise addressed to his wife, admonishing her not to marry again if he died first. In speaking of the resurrection he says to her: "There will at that day be no resumption of voluptuous disgrace between us;" and in another treatise he remarks: "Let us ponder over our consciousness itself to see how different a man feels himself when he chances to be deprived of his wife. He savours spiritually."

Tertullian, for his age, is exceptional in

the strength of his denunciations, and the Church so far adhered to the Apostolic permission as to allow laymen to marry twice.

This antagonism to marriage had a great influence on family life. It is strange how seldom children are mentioned in the Christian writings of the second and third centuries. Almost nothing is said of their training; no efforts are mentioned as being made for their instruction. The Christians had come to the belief that the world had enough of children, and was fully stocked, and that every birth was a cause of sorrow and not of joy. One writer interprets the wail of the infant as he enters the world thus: "Why, O mother, didst thou bring me forth to this life, in which prolongation of life is progress to death? Why hast thou brought me into this troubled world, in which, on being born, swaddling bands are my first experience? Why hast thou delivered me to such a life as this, in which a pitiable youth wastes away before old age, and old age is shunned as under the doom of death? Dreadful, O mother, is the course of life which has death as the goal of the runner. Bitter is the road of life we travel, with the grave as the wayfarer's inn." Tertullian says: "Further reasons for marriage which men allege for themselves arise from anxiety for posterity, and the bitter, bitter pleasure of children. To us this is idle. For why should we be eager to bear children, whom, when we have them, we desire to send before us to glory (in respect, I mean, of the distresses that are now imminent); desirous as we are ourselves to be taken out of this most wicked world and received into the Lord's presence." He describes children as "burdens which are to us most of all unsuitable, as being perilous to faith." And again: "Let the well known burdensomeness of children, especially in our case, suffice to counsel widowhood—children whom men are compelled by laws to have, because no wise man would ever willingly have desired sons." And he exclaims, "A Christian forsooth will seek heirs, disinherited as he is from the entire world."

Such ideas had necessarily a very powerful effect on the place and position of woman and on the conception of her nature. What was that effect? I will attempt to describe it in a few words. I may define man to be a male human being, and woman to be a female human being. They are both human beings, both gifted with reason and conscience, both responsible for their actions, both entitled to the freedom essential to this responsibility, and both capable

of the noblest thoughts and deeds. As human beings they are on an equality as to their powers, the differences in individuals resulting from the surroundings and circumstances of spiritual growth. But man is a male and woman is a female, and this distinction exists in Nature for the continuance of the race. Now what the early Christians did was to strike the male out of the definition of man and human being out of the definition of woman. Man was a human being made for the highest and noblest purposes; woman was a female made to serve only one. She was on the earth to inflame the heart of man with every evil passion. She was a fire-ship continually striving to get alongside the male man-of-war to blow him up into pieces. This is the way in which Tertullian addresses women: "Do you not know that each one of you is an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that forbidden tree; you are the first deserter of the divine law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die." And the gentle Clement of Alexandria hits her hard when he says: "Nothing disgraceful is proper for man, who is endowed with reason; much less for woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is." Gregory Thaumaturgus asserts: "Moreover, among all women I sought for chastity proper to them, and I found it in none. And verily, a person may find one man chaste among a thousand, but a woman never." The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs makes a similar statement, and adds: "By means of their adornment they deceive first the minds of men, and they instil poison by the glance of their eye, and then they take them captive by their doings," and therefore "men should guard their senses against every woman." "The angel of God showed me," it says in another passage, "that for ever do women bear rule over king and beggar alike; and from the king they take away his glory, and from the valiant man his strength, and from the beggar even that little which is the stay of his poverty." How, then, were men to treat this frivolous, dress-loving, lust-inspiring creature? Surely the best plan was to shut her up. Her clear duty was to stay at home, and not let herself be seen anywhere. And this duty the Christian writers impress upon her again

and again. She is not to go to banquets, where her looks are sure to create evil thoughts in the minds of men who are drinking largely of wine. She is not to go to marriage feasts, where the talk and the songs may border on licentiousness. Of course she is not to wander about the streets in search of sights, nor to frequent the theatre, nor the public baths, nor the spectacles. Does she want exercise? Clement of Alexandria prescribes for her: "She is to exercise herself in spinning and weaving, and superintending the cooking, if necessary." He adds: "Women are with their own hand to fetch from the store what we require; and it is no disgrace for them to apply themselves to the mill. Nor is it a reproach to a wife—housekeeper and helpmeet—to occupy herself in cooking, so that it may be palatable to her husband. And if she shake up the couch, reach drink to her husband when thirsty, set food on the table as neatly as possible, and so give herself exercise tending to sound health, the Instructor will approve of a woman like this." During the only occasions on which she may quit her own house, namely, when visiting the sick or going to church, she must be veiled—not a portion of her face must be seen, and when she is in church she must remain covered. These are the injunctions which occur repeatedly in the Christian writers. Voices were raised against this ascetic treatment, among them that of one Bishop of Rome, but they were drowned in the current of invectives that were directed against woman's love of dress and finery and show. These invectives and discussions on the dress of women and veiling of virgins are numerous. Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, and the Apostolic Constitutions deal minutely with the subject—all on the idea that woman is a most inflammatory being. Is a woman beautiful? "Natural grace," says Tertullian, "must be obliterated by concealment and negligence, as being dangerous to the glances of the beholder's eyes." Then she must clothe herself from head to foot. In speaking of her going to church, Clement of Alexandria says: "Let her be entirely covered, unless she happen to be at home. For that style of dress is grave and protects from being gazed at. And she will never fall who puts before her face modesty and her shawl; nor will she invite another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled."

Then she must not adorn herself in any way. "It is not right in God," says Com-

modian, "that a faithful Christian woman should be adorned." The purpose of clothing is to defend the body against excess of cold and intensity of heat, and the simplest materials are sufficient for this purpose. The Christian woman must therefore bid farewell to embroidery of gold and Indian silks; she is strictly forbidden to wear gold ornaments of any kind, and she is to avoid all dyed clothes, as the dye is unnecessary for health, afflicts greedy eyes, and moreover it is false; for God would have made the sheep purple, if He had wished the woollen clothes to be purple. Strong condemnation is uttered against any attempt to trick out the person. "Head-dresses," says Clement of Alexandria, "and varieties of head-dresses, and elaborate braidings, and infinite modes of dressing the hair, and costly mirrors in which they arrange their costume, are characteristic of women who have lost all shame." And if the adornment of the natural body is thus condemned, the endless variety of artificial contrivances employed by the Roman and Greek ladies is necessarily considered abominable. In regard to the hair, Cyprian addresses virgins thus: "Are sincerity and truth preserved when what is sincere is polluted by adulterous colours, and what is true is changed into a lie by the deceitful dyes of medicaments? Your Lord says, 'Thou canst not make one hair black or white,' and you in order to overcome the word of your Lord, will be more mighty than He, and stain your hair with a daring endeavour, and with profane contempt; with evil presage of the future, make a beginning to yourself already of flame-coloured hair." And he uses equally strong expressions in regard to tinting the eyes. "You cannot see God, since your eyes are not those which God made, but those which the devil has spoiled. You have followed him, you have imitated the red and painted eyes of the serpent. As you are adorned in the fashion of your enemy, with him also you shall burn by-and-by." And he thus sums up the exhortations which he addresses to the virgins: "Let your countenance remain in you incorrupt, your neck unadorned, your figure simple: let not wounds be made in your ears, nor let the precious chain of bracelets and necklaces circle your arms or your neck; let your feet be free from golden bands, your hair stained with no dye, your eyes worthy of beholding God." Notwithstanding all the exhortations which were showered upon the wives and virgins, the Christian writings prove that human nature often had its own way. Both Clem-

ent and Cyprian tell dreadful stories of some of the virgins, and in the treatise of Cyprian, from which I have quoted, there are lamentations like this: "For this reason, therefore, the Church frequently mourns over her virgins; hence she groans at their scandalous and detestable stories; hence the flower of her virgins is extinguished, the honour and modesty of continency are injured, and all its glory and dignity are profaned." At the same time we ought to do justice to the self-control and perseverance with which many pursued their high ideal—for the ideal was a high one, as the purity aimed at was not corporeal merely, but extended over the whole range of life. "For it would be ridiculous," says one of the virgins in Methodius, "to preserve the lustful members pure, but not the tongue, or to preserve the tongue, but neither the eyesight, the ears nor the hands, or lastly to preserve these pure but not the mind, defiling it with pride and anger."

Such then was the position of women among the early Christians. We have said nothing of Christian legislation, for we have been treating of a period when the legislation was carried on entirely by pagans. But we ought to mention two facts, or two phases of one fact which had a great effect on the destinies of mankind, but especially of woman, and which have found their way into modern legislation. The Roman father had absolute power of life and of death over his children in the primitive times of Rome. Gradually this power slackened, but he retained to the end of heathendom the right to expose his children, and pagan sentiment supported him in such conduct. The infants on their birth might be drowned or exposed to the cold air, or starved or abandoned to wild beasts. In this way deformed and weakly children were left to perish. A very large number of the children who were thus disposed of were girls. Christianity condemned this practice from the first as murder. It went further. It was a question with the ancients at what time the human *fœtus* became a living being, and many maintained that the soul came to it only when it was born. Tertullian has discussed this subject fully in his *Treatise on the Soul*. He says: "This view [that the *fœtus* has no soul] is entertained by the Stoics, along with Aenesidemus, and occasionally by Plato himself, when he tells us that the soul, being quite a separate formation, originating elsewhere and externally to the womb, is inhaled when the new-born infant first draws breath." This was the opinion prevalent among all classes of the

Pagan world, and the practice was universal and avowed of killing the *fœtus* by drugs. But Christianity took the other view, that the soul came at the earliest stage, and maintained that it was equally sinful "to take away a life that is born, or destroy one that is coming to birth." Accordingly the heathen practice was forbidden by the Church. The prohibition made its appearance at an early period in Christianity, for it occurs in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, written about the beginning of the second century, and we are told that Peter says in the *Apocalypse* (an apocryphal writing probably of early date) "that abortive infants shall share the better fate: that these are committed to a guardian angel, so that, on receiving knowledge, they may obtain the better abode, having had the same experiences which they would have had, had they been in the body."

This view of the Christians in regard to infanticide would tend largely to increase the number of women in the world, as infant girls were the most frequent victims of the practice. The ascetic tendency, on the other hand, repressed the growth of population. It had also a deteriorating effect on posterity. The less spiritual classes of the people, the laymen, being taught that marriage might be licentious and that it implied an inferior state of sanctity, were rather inclined to neglect matrimony for more loose connections, and it was these persons alone that then peopled the world. It was the survival of the unfittest. The noble men and women, on the other hand, who were dominated by the loftiest aspirations and exhibited the greatest temperance, self-control and virtue, left no children. During this period there is a striking absence of home life in the history of Christians. No son succeeds his father, no wife comforts the wearied student, no daughter soothes the sorrow of the aged bishop. Perhaps this absence of domestic affection, this deficiency in healthy and vigorous offspring, this homelessness, may account in some degree for the striking features of the next century, and especially the prevalent hardness of heart. Then men disputed with the utmost bitterness and ferocity about minute points of doctrine which are now incomprehensible almost to every one, and matters of absolute indifference to this generation, and they pronounced sentence of eternal damnation without the slightest compunction on all who differed from them. Then treatises were written to show why every heretic should be put to death in this life and tortured eternally in the life to come.

And there is scarcely a champion of the faith orthodox or heterodox who was not accused of fearful crimes. If a lesson is to be drawn it surely is that, as with individuals there is no place like home, so with a State, there is no institution like home; that a community can be great only where there are happy, harmonious and virtuous homes, and that homes cannot be happy and harmonious and virtuous unless woman is accorded a worthy place in these homes, with freedom of action, with a consciousness of responsibility, and with the right, unfettered by circumstance or prejudice, to develop all that is best and noblest in her to the utmost perfection.

GIORDANO BRUNO: HIS LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY.

BY C. E. PLUMPTRE.

From *The Westminster Review* (London), August, 1880.

IN 1885 an English National Committee in connection with one that was International (begun ten years earlier, we believe) was formed to procure the erection of a monument to Giordano Bruno, as a fitting though tardy tribute of the gratitude due from men of science and philosophy of all nations to the Italian philosopher; and on the 9th of last June this design saw completion. At about 10.30 on that morning, amid an immense crowd, and with the advantage of glorious weather, the procession, consisting of six thousand representatives of the Association, with nineteen hundred and seventy banners and standards, together with about one hundred musicians, wended its way to the Campo dei Fiori, where, on February 17, 1600, Giordano Bruno was burnt alive. Its arrival there was the signal for immense acclamation, while the banners were gradually placed around the monument. At eleven precisely, trumpets were blown to announce that the unveiling of the statue was about to take place. The writer of these pages was not fortunate enough to be present, and therefore cannot speak with the authority of an eye-witness; but, according to Italian newspapers that have been received, the statue is in all respects worthy of the occasion, being one of the finest and most completely finished works of the eminent Italian sculptor, Ettore Ferrari. The philosopher is represented as being buried in profound thought, having in his left hand a book, which he has just ceased to read; while his right

hand presses with a sort of nervous tension that which holds the book, the contents of which are evidently the cause of the far-away look in Bruno's eyes. At the base of the monument there are, in *basso relievi*, three representations of Bruno at different periods of his career—viz., one where he is arguing with the doctors of the University of Oxford; another, where his sentence of death is being pronounced upon him; a third, where that sentence is about to be fulfilled in the *Campo dei Fiori*. On another portion of the medallion there are representations of the following apostles of Free-thought: Wickliffe, Huss, Servetus, Paleario, Ramus, Sarpi, Vanini, and Campanella. On the frontage of the basement there is the following inscription by Bovio: *IX. Guigno, MDCCCLXXXIX. A Bruno—il secolo da lui divinato—qui dove il rogo—arse.*

Around this monument were placed about 150 wreaths, one bearing the inscription *Le donne triestine*. At 11.45 the senator Maleschott, the sculptor Ferrari, and Basso, the President of the Committee, ascended a platform, in order to receive certain official documents in connection with the monument; and then amid enthusiastic cries of *Viva Bruno! Viva il Martire del libero pensiero!* the statue was unveiled. A discourse by the orator Bovio completed the ceremony, and at about 12.50 the procession left the Campo dei Fiori in order to do honour to the memory of Garibaldi.

The connection of England with the monument of Bruno has brought the name of the Italian philosopher into unusual prominence in this country, while his works are still of extreme rarity. It has occurred therefore to the present writer that a few pages in description of his life and philosophy might not be unwelcome to the readers of this magazine, for their better comprehension of the position Bruno fills in the sixteenth century, and his consequent claims to be remembered by posterity.

For the readier achievement of this object it is necessary to commence with a rapid glance at the various events and influences immediately preceding or succeeding his birth. Few, if any, are entirely independent of their environment; but Bruno, notwithstanding that in many of his scientific speculations he was in advance of his age, was yet, in his personality, peculiarly the product of his own period, not merely by virtue of the interaction between organism and environment common to all, but also and even in greater degree by reaction and rebellion against the prejudices and retro-

grading influences of his age, which eventually brought upon him the wrath of the Inquisition and led to his death.

Giordano Bruno was born at Nola, in Naples, in 1548; five years after the death of him who had dethroned the earth from the sovereign position she had previously been believed to hold in the solar system—Copernicus. Magellan had been dead barely twenty-seven years, and the circumnavigation of the world and the new ideas resulting therefrom were still in the freshness of novelty. Luther had died in 1546, and the Church was still agitated by the great Reformer's denunciations of her enormities. Of more importance still, unhappily for Bruno, was the sudden renewal of rigour in the Inquisition, consequent probably upon the spread of Lutheranism. Nor must the Italian Renaissance with all her varied influences be left unnoticed. Her ardour for classical learning, her love for art, her practical paganism, all combined to give a hitherto unsurpassed predominance to this present world, with its interests and pursuits; to throw into shadow the vague future world, about which there was, if not explicitly, at least implicitly, considerable scepticism. Strange divergent influences truly! On the one hand, the earth with her interests, her hopes and fears, her ambitions and pursuits—the earth, that is to say, considered relatively to *man*, acquired suddenly a supreme importance. Considered relatively to the *universe*, nay, even to that one portion of the universe called the solar system, she sank with equal suddenness to supreme insignificance—a small globe whirled round with other globes, many of which were larger than herself, in obedience to the power of their sovereign ruler the Sun. One other influence remains to be noticed, most important of all perhaps to Bruno, because of the reactionary antagonism excited within him by it—viz., the unpalatable intermixture of gross hypocrisy and abject superstition, beneath which the larger portion of the religious catholic world were sunk in Italy. It was into this chaos of divergent influences, this strange medley of new beliefs, arising from the ashes of the old, fast dying away or even already dead, that Giordano Bruno, one of the most impressive of men, was born.

Now let us take a rapid glance at the events closely succeeding Bruno's birth in order to realize more completely the exact position he fills in the history of philosophical thought. In 1561, thirteen years after his own birth, was born Lord Bacon, the founder of the inductive philosophy; three

years later, Galileo, a full believer, though a somewhat timid supporter, of the Copernican system. Ten years later than Galileo, John Kepler, the discoverer of the three laws that bear his name, was born. In 1564 our great English dramatist Shakespeare;* in 1632 Benedict Spinoza, and in 1646 Leibnitz. With all these writers Bruno had points in common, and if the influence he exercised upon them was not in every case direct, its indirectness must not let us lose sight of its significance. Nature is a supreme plagiarist, and the thoughts of such few among her sons as are really great she echoes and re-echoes, arraying them in various dresses, sometimes in veritable disguises; heedless apparently whether the name of their true originator survive, so long only as the thoughts themselves shall live. So far as we know, Kepler was the only writer among these that we have enumerated who confessed his indebtedness to Bruno, and he only in private correspondence. But with each of the others, especially Spinoza and Leibnitz, the resemblance is too great to be accidental, though it is quite possible the imitation was unconscious. One man soweth, another reapeth, and the seed expands and grows till it ceases to be recognizable in the fulness of the blossom; while, in their gratitude for the latter, men are apt to forget the greater importance of the former.

Giordano Bruno was born, as we have said, in 1548, his father's profession being that of a soldier. His baptismal name was Filippo, but he exchanged it for the one by which he is now known—Giordano—when he entered the Dominican convent at Naples in his fifteenth year: the very same convent where some three hundred years previously the angelic doctor, Aquinas, had lived and studied. The Dominicans had a reputation for learning. Bruno, from a young child, had a passion for knowledge; and he tells us himself that he selected the Dominican order in preference to others because he thought that in it this passion would have greater chance of gratification. Unhappily for him, his love for knowledge grew by what it fed on. He could not content himself with the answers given to his inquiries by the monks, and from his eighteenth year doubts, especially upon the subject of the Trinity, grew upon him. Yet he so far controlled these doubts that he seems to have spent thirteen years of his life in monastic seclusion without any strong desire to leave. The seclusion was of a modified de-

* Many German writers have considered Shakespeare to be largely indebted to Bruno, alike for several of his metaphors and some few of his scientific allusions.

scription, the Dominicans, or Preaching Brothers as they were called, being in the habit of constantly travelling about in pursuit of their religious offices. Bruno's published writings show that his official duties must have at least allowed him sufficient leisure to acquaint himself very widely with the Oriental and European writers of philosophy. In this convent he probably wrote his two earliest works—i.e., the *Candle-Bearer* and the *Noah's Ark*. The latter work has disappeared; the former stands first in Wagner's Leipsic edition of his Italian works; and within the limits of this paper we intend to confine ourselves to an analysis only of such of Bruno's works as are published in Italian.

Il Candelaio, or *Candle-Bearer*, is a slight comedy, written in the taste of the period, in which Bruno satirizes Love, Alchemy, and Pedantry. It is not worthy of his later works, but it is interesting to students as a proof of the antagonism he was already beginning to feel at that early age towards the superstitions and pedantries of his contemporaries. The thirteen years spent by Bruno under monastic discipline had been by no means years of uninterrupted peace for him. Doubts of various kinds increased upon him, and the petty tyranny and love of small authority exhibited by monastic officials galled him and made him inwardly rebellious. Twice he received reprimands for some slight breach of discipline. On a third occasion the reprimand was so much more serious that, fearing that he might be cast into prison, he deemed it wiser to take the precaution of escape. He sought refuge in a convent at Rome belonging to his order, but finding that the suit against him was renewed and followed him to Rome, in 1576 he took the serious step of casting off his habit and abandoning the religious life. Taught by experience to dread discovery, he resumed his baptismal name of *Filippo*; and from this time forward we find him passing now under one name and now under another. He wandered about for some days until he arrived at Genoa, where he made a brief sojourn; thence to Noli, Piedmont, Turin, and other towns and cities of Italy, always supporting himself by teaching. In 1579 he found himself at Geneva, where he sought employment as a corrector of proofs in one of the printing-houses, and seems to have fallen into some ill favour with the University of Geneva for having called the ministers of the Church *pedagogues*. We next find him at Lyons and Toulouse, and thence, in 1581, he travelled northwards to Paris. Here he met with better treatment

than had previously been his lot. He was made "Professor Extraordinary," and became on terms of warm friendship with Henri III. Three books on the Art of Raymond Lully he published during this French sojourn. The *Candle-Bearer*, though probably written many years earlier, he also now published. In 1583 Bruno went to England, and the two years spent there seem to have been the happiest years of his adult life. He lived in the house of Castelnau de Mauvissière, and dedicated four of his works to him. Fulke Greville, Philip Sidney, and other men of learning and knightly worth were among his friends. In June of this year he was allowed to hold a public disputation before the Chancellor of Oxford upon the Copernican theory, but apparently there was little agreement between him and his audience, and he records with some bitterness that he hardly knows which ought to be condemned the most, the beer-drinking propensities of the undergraduates or the hopeless pedantry of their seniors.

The *Cena delle Ceneri* (Supper of Ashes), or Evening Conversations on Ash Wednesday, stands second in Wagner's edition of Bruno's Italian works, and is the first bearing a dedication to the French Ambassador, Castelnau de Mauvissière. It consists of five dialogues between Smitho an Englishman, Teofilo a philosopher (presumably Bruno himself), Prudenziio a pedant, and Frulla, a character introduced probably for diversion, whose chief employment consists in making jests that are more or less unseemly. These dialogues are concerned principally with two subjects: a lively description of his life in London, and an investigation into the Copernican theory, which Bruno cannot help feeling is strangely divergent from the Mosaic account of creation. He is careful, however, to point out that the philosophy of Copernicus is favoured in many passages of the Book of Job, for which book he had an immense admiration, describing it in his fourth dialogue as "one of the most singular that can be read, full of all good theology, physics, and morality, abounding with wisest discourses, which Moses added as a sacrament to the book of his Laws."

It is in the *Cena delle Ceneri* that Bruno first displays his true attitude towards Aristotelianism, and more especially towards that scholasticism which, while sheltering itself under the name of Aristotle, totally ignored the true method of the master himself. To understand Bruno's denunciation of Aristotelianism, we must remember that under the influence of scholasticism the

great Stagirite had been endowed with an infallibility which assuredly he would not have claimed for himself. The test of any new doctrine, any scientific discovery, was held to be found not in experiment, nor in argument, but in the support it might or might not receive from the works of Aristotle. Nay, the mere omission of reference in Aristotle to any subject was considered sufficient negative proof to condemn it, or at least to exclude it from all further investigation. And Bruno seemed at times to be excited to an absolute hatred to a philosophical bigotry and intolerance that threatened to impede all further knowledge as much as religious intolerance itself. There is an anecdote told, for instance, of a certain student who, having detected spots on the sun, communicated his discovery to a priest. "My son," replied the priest, "I have read Aristotle many times, and I can assure you that there is nothing of the kind mentioned by him. Go in peace, and learn to convince yourself that the spots which you have seen are in your own eyes, and not in the sun." This pseudo-Aristotelianism served indeed as a sort of convenient cloak to religious bigotry, for its scientific support was chiefly claimed as a verification of the Mosaic account of creation. Bruno had no wish unduly to decry Aristotle; but he did not disguise his opinion that reverence for him, and indeed for all authority, considered as mere authority, carried to a superstitious extent, must be a hindrance to all true progress; and in this *Cena*, endeavouring to relegate Aristotle to his true place in the history of thought, Bruno pointed to a fact that is even now hardly sufficiently recognized—viz., that what are called the *olden* ages, the *ancient* times, are in reality the *early* ages, the *youthful* times; and, conversely, that what are spoken of as the recent and modern times, are in reality the older. The world, for instance—now well-nigh on its twentieth century—is older by more than four hundred years than when Bruno pointed out this great truth; and he was led to the statement because he had been rebuked for his presumption in venturing to question the authority of one who had lived so many years earlier than himself as Aristotle, the inference drawn being that because Aristotle had lived so many years earlier, therefore must his opinion be of proportionately greater value. Bruno rightly perceived that the exact converse of this is the case; and though some of his works, taken as a whole, are finer than the *Cena delle Ceneri*, we doubt whether any of them contain a truth of greater value than where

he thus relegates authority to its rightful place.

The *Della Causa, Principio et Uno* is a sort of continuation of, or at all events has a certain connection with, the *Cena delle Ceneri*. The scene is still laid in England, and Teofilo again forms the chief among the *dramatis personæ*. Smitho's place is filled by Dicsono Arelio; the pedant is called Poliinnio, while Gervasio is substituted for Frulla. It is dedicated to "Michel di Castelnau, Signor di Mauvissiero," the distinguished French Ambassador to England, Castelnau de la Mauvissière.

It is in the *Della Causa Principio et Uno* that Bruno's relationship to Spinoza is best to be seen.

"What is the efficient cause?" asks Dicsono.

"I affirm," answers Teofilo, "the physical universal efficient to be the universal intellect. This is that One which fills the great whole, which illuminates the universe, which directs Nature to produce its species in the way which is most suitable. This, I understand, to be that One in all things which produces diverse configurations and works out divers faculties."

"Will you distinguish what you mean by extrinsic cause and intrinsic cause?" asks Dicsono.

And in reply Teofilo defines his *causa intrinseca* and *causa extrinseca* very much as Spinoza his *Natura Naturans* and *Natura Naturata*, Nature acting and Nature acted on. Or, to use more modern phraseology, both would affirm the One Sole Cause and Principle of Things, to be the *noumenon*, of which the multiform modes of existence we see around us are but *phenomena*.

Yet the work most necessary for us to study in order to comprehend Bruno's exact place in modern science and philosophy is his *De l'Infinito Universo e Mondi*; and it is to an analysis of this work, therefore, that we purpose to devote most space.

We must bear in mind that in the latter half of the sixteenth century the Copernican theory was still in the freshness of novelty, and that it had come upon Bruno as a sort of revelation. It had more than a scientific value for him, though he would have been the last to under-estimate its scientific importance. But he was of a keenly imaginative bent, possessing that kind of imagination—what Wordsworth calls "the vision and the faculty divine"—which achieves discoveries by a sort of intuition. He pondered and brooded over this new revelation, this revulsion of thought, which relegated the earth from her position of sovereignty

to that of helpless submission, from the place of ruler to ruled, till he seemed penetrated by it. He examined it in all its bearings, gathering with each examination increased consciousness of its importance, till suddenly, and as it were by a leap, its full significance burst upon him. What if this solar system of ours was but one system among myriads? What if the position our earth fills towards the sun was but the same as that sun himself fills in a still larger system? As with the Copernican theory, this new conception had for him more than a scientific value. It came as a sort of religion to his poetic impressionable soul, filling him with that mysterious consciousness of the Infinite as sublime as it is bewildering. And from thenceforth Bruno became the apostle of the Sidereal system. If the modern conception of the Solar system rightly bears the name of "Copernican," no less rightly, it seems to us, should the modern conception of the Sidereal system bear the name of "Bruncean," or possibly, as Bruno would have preferred the nomenclature, the "Nolan" theory. Yet owing to some strange irony of fate, Copernicus, dying peaceably in his bed at an advanced age, unconscious it is true of his own future greatness, yet suffering few of the penalties of greatness, has been long associated with a distinctly new epoch in astronomical discovery. Bruno, on the contrary, who paid the penalty of his greatness by a long imprisonment and a cruel death, has been until lately almost ignored, and even now we rarely find him mentioned in any history of modern astronomy. Yet as much greater as is the discovery of the sidereal system than that of the solar system, so much greater, it seems to us, should Bruno be considered than Copernicus.

Yet Bruno, while possessed of a longing almost unsurpassed to penetrate the mystery of the universe that presses upon most thoughtful minds, was comparatively but little oppressed with what the Germans have called *Welt-Schmerz* (i.e., world-sorrow), or that consciousness of the burden and mystery of human suffering which has afflicted so many thinkers from the writer of Ecclesiastes to Schopenhauer and Leopardi. And in this as in other ways he shows himself to be a child of his own period. In the sixteenth century man himself had not come to be regarded as the proper study of man, but rather the place on which he dwelt, its relationship to the sun, and finally the position filled by it in space. Consequently, it was the infinite glory of the universe that filled the mind of Bruno;

the consideration of the majesty and omniscience of the One Sole Cause of all things that animated him till he was raised, as it were, above the contemplation of earthly things, and seemed hardly in touch with humanity. Whensoever he did descend from this high pedestal, it was in a mood that was slighter and altogether less worthy. The pedantries and stupidities of his contemporaries were derided by him with light banter, sometimes with scathing satire, but too often couched in language according with the coarse taste of the day. All his nobler, all his more fervent, thoughts were given to the contemplation of things celestial. In this wise he fully deserved with Spinoza the name of "God-intoxicated." The whence and how of the Cosmos in all its unrealizable grandeur penetrated him with a sort of irresistible fascination, but the why and wherefore of sin and misery but little disturbed him; nor does he seem to have asked himself how the superstitions he so contemptuously derided should have been allowed to take root and flourish. This is the more remarkable, because Bruno was no ascetic; still less cynical or morose. He was bright-hearted and, we should judge, eminently lovable—at once grateful for kindness and appreciative of goodness; and therefore to a certain extent must have belonged to that order of mind called sympathetic. Yet that indignation against wrongdoing, that yearning and compassion called out by suffering almost inseparable from sympathetic natures, he seems to have felt but little. And the interpretation is, we think, that he gave to humanity but his passing moods; to Divine Wisdom his soul and passion. We use the word *passion* advisedly, because Bruno was very fond of comparing his passion for wisdom with that of the lover's yearning for his mistress.

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* was dedicated to Castelnau, in a somewhat lengthy preface descriptive of his book, which has been translated by Toland; though of the work itself, so far as we are aware, there is no English translation as yet.

Bruno commences his preface by complaining of the treatment bestowed upon him for his devotion to the study of Nature, for the contempt he feels towards popular authority, and for his love towards "one particular lady: It is for her that I am free in servitude, content in pain, rich in necessity, and alive in death. Hence it is even from my passion for this beauty that, as being weary, I draw not back my feet from the difficult road, nor, as bewildered, divert my gaze from the divine object. . . . If I

err, I am far from thinking I do; and whether I speak or write, I dispute not for victory (for I look upon all reputation and conquest to be hateful to God, to be vile and dishonourable without truth), but it is for the love of true wisdom, and by the studious admiration of this mistress, that I fatigue and torment myself." Then, after describing the leading arguments in his book, he breaks forth into a rapturous eulogy upon the new point of view it presents to the reader, comparing it with the old received notion of the position of the earth, thus: "This is that philosophy which opens the senses, which enlarges the understanding, and satisfies the mind. Look to it now, gentlemen astrologers, with your humble servants the natural philosophers, and see to what use you can put your circles that are described by the imaginary nine movable spheres, in which you so imprison your brains that you seem to me like so many parrots in their cages, hopping and dancing from one perch to another, yet always winding and turning within the same wires. But be it known unto you that so great an emperor hath not so narrow a palace, or so low a tribunal, but rather an infinite representation of an infinite original, and a spectacle befitting the excellency and eminence of Him that can neither be imagined, nor conceived, nor comprehended. Thus the excellency of God is magnified and the grandeur of His empire made manifest, since He is glorified not in one, but in numberless suns; not in one earth or world, but in ten hundred thousand, in infinite globes." The conclusion of this dedication shows Bruno to be fully conscious of the importance of his work, and of himself as its writer, notwithstanding the little recognition he has as yet received; and he bids Castelnau look upon him as one "whom you are not to entertain among your domestics as having need of him, but as a person having need of you for so many and great purposes as you here see. Consider that for having such numbers at hand bound to serve you, you are thereby nothing different from farmers, bankers, or merchants; but that for having a man deserving to be by you encouraged, protected, and assisted, you are in reality (what you have always shown yourself to be) like unto magnanimous princes, heroes, and gods, who have ordained such as you for the defence of their friends."

The *Infinito Universo e Mondi* consists of five dialogues, the *dramatis personæ* being Elpino, an upholder of Aristotle's opinions; Piloteo, occasionally called Teofilo, evidently Bruno himself; and two minor personages,

introduced more or less for the sake of diversion. In the fifth dialogue a new character is introduced, who is called Albertino, and who is represented as one having sufficient ability and freedom from prejudice to understand the new conception of the universe, notwithstanding that by education he is an Aristotelian.

The first dialogue is chiefly devoted to a dissertation on the unreliability of the senses, Bruno asserting that it is only by careful comparison of one object with another that even a proximate knowledge can be attained. From this he proceeds to the question of the infinity of the universe, and in clear, concise language, almost worthy of Herbert Spencer himself, shows what Mr. Spencer has so ably demonstrated in his *First Principles*, that a finite universe is a contradiction in terms. By no manner of possibility are we able to conceive the universe bounded by nothing. It is true that to our finite intellect an infinite universe is also incapable of clear presentation to our thoughts, but (as it seems to us) the difference between these two difficulties is one not of degree, but of kind. The one difficulty is simply that the finite cannot grasp the Infinite; the other involves what any finite mind, if he will but rightly consider, must see to be a glaring contradiction in itself. Finite means *bounded*, and bounded implies bounded by *something*, and thus by no possibility can we conceive space bounded; for that by which space is bounded must itself lie in space. In clear, precise language Bruno shows that we are perfectly able to conceive finite globes, but not finite space: "Io dico l'universo tutto infinito, per che non ha margine, termine, nè superficie; dico, l'universo non essere totalmente infinito, per che ciascuna parte, che di quello possiamo prendere, è finita, e de' mondi innumerabili, che contiene, ciascuno è finito. Io dico Dio tutto infinito, per che da se esclude ogni termine, et ogni suo attributo e Uno et Infinito; e dico Dio totalmente infinito, per che tutto lui è in tutto il mondo et in ciascuna sua parte infinitamente e totalmente: al contrario de l'infinità de l'universo, la quale è totalmente in tutto, e non in queste parti, se pur, riferendosi a l'infinito, possono esser chiamate parti, che noi possiamo comprendere in quello."

From the consideration of an infinite universe Bruno proceeds to the scientific conception of infinite motion. Each world he maintains to be in unceasing motion; this motion is intrinsic, and proceeds from no external pressure, yet he thinks that there must be an infinite power acting through-

out the entire universe at once both "extensively and intensively."

The same subject is continued in the second dialogue, and very many of the same arguments; but Bruno imports into this dialogue a discussion upon the proof of the infinity of the universe afforded by gravity and levity; Elpino repeating all the arguments of Aristotle, while Fileteo examines and refutes them.

The third dialogue deals with the shape and figure of the spheres and the number and diversity of the heavens, Bruno declaring that, so far from "Heaven" being one, there are an infinite number of "heavens," taking that word in its usual signification; for as this earth has its heaven, which is that region of space wherein it moves and performs its course, so has each and every other of the innumerable worlds in the universe its own particular heaven. In one sense only can we affirm heaven to be one, and that is, as being the general space which contains infinite worlds. Then he shows that every star has its own particular motion. He explains the difference between stars or suns, and planets, and shows that the former have light in themselves, and the latter but reflected light. He examines also the doctrine of Cusanus about the probability of these other worlds being inhabited, inclining to such a belief himself. The fourth dialogue repeats what has been said in former dialogues as to the infinity of worlds, their formation and motion, and a further explanation is given of gravity and levity. How thoroughly Bruno grasped and realized the office, so omnipresent and unceasing, that gravity fills throughout the entire universe, from the hugest system of stars to the smallest object, is shown by his apt illustration of a stone, which, he argues, were it placed between two worlds of equal size, and at an exactly similar distance from each, would remain motionless, being equally balanced in space by the gravity that in equal proportions belongs to each world. He shows that there are worlds of all sizes, and systems of various degrees of complexity; that the universe has "no margin, no extremity;" and that therefore, though each globe has its own centre, and has a relation to the common centre of the whole, we cannot discover a centre in a universe which is infinite. Indeed, he might with perfect justice in support of his position have described his conception of the universe in that fine phrase familiar to most of us as "having its circumference nowhere and its centre everywhere." In this dialogue he also touches upon the nature of

comets, which he seems to think has a certain resemblance to that of planets.

The fifth dialogue is principally devoted to twelve objections, which Albertino, the new interlocutor, brings to Bruno's doctrine of the plurality of worlds. Bruno's conviction of the greater sublimity of his own conception of the Cosmos, is best to be seen in the preface to his *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, to which we have already alluded. We will quote the following passages from it because they will serve to show not only his ardour and enthusiasm for this new conception, but also the singular extent to which he seemed elevated by it from all touch with human hopes and fears:—

"These are the doubts and motives, the solution of which we have said enough to expose the intimate and radical errors of the common philosophy, and to show the weight and importance of our own. Here you will learn the reason why we should not fear that any part of this universe should fall or fly off, that the least particle should be lost in empty space, or be truly annihilated. Here you will find the reason of the vicissitude and mutation of all things, whereby nothing is really ill that befalls from which we may not escape, nor good to which we cannot run; since in this infinite field, in spite of this constant mutation, the substance itself remains ever the same. From this contemplation, if we will but duly observe, it will follow that no unexpected accident, whether of grief or pain, should disturb us, nor any hope nor good fortune unduly elate us, whence we shall have the true way to perfect morality and thus may become great enough to be able to despise such things as are greatly esteemed by men of small or childish minds, and to be able to work out for themselves the divine laws engraven upon our hearts. For we shall know that it is no more difficult to fly from hence up to heaven than to fly from heaven back again to earth, since ascending thither and descending hither are all one. For we are no more surrounded by other globes than they are by our globe, nor are they more central to us than we to them; neither do they press upon the stars more than we, as they no less than we are comprehended by the same sky. Behold us then free from envy! Behold us delivered from the vain anxiety and foolish care of desiring to enjoy that good afar off which we may possess close at hand and near. Behold us freed from that greater terror that they should fall upon us any more than we should hope that we might fall upon them, since our globe, like the others, is sustained

by the same infinite ether (*aria*) ; thus this our animal (*animale**) freely runs through that part of space confined to his own region, as the other planets do to theirs. Did we but consider and comprehend all this, oh ! to what greater consideration and comprehension might we not be carried ! since by means of this science we should be sure to obtain happiness, which in other sciences is sought after in vain.

"This is that philosophy . . . which leads man to the only true beatitude possible to him as man, for it delivers him from solicitous pursuit of pleasure and blind dread of misery, bidding him enjoy the present, neither to dread nor to look forward with hope to the future, since that same Providence or Fate or Fortune which causes all vicissitudes that befall us, will let us know no more of the one than of the other, though at first sight it is natural to feel doubtful and perplexed. Yet if we will consider carefully the substance and being of that into which we are mutable, we shall find that there is no death attending us, nor any other real substance, since nothing is substantially diminished ; but everything as it courses through infinite space, simply changes its form. Thus everything being subjected to a good and most efficient cause, we should believe and hope that as everything proceeds from good, so must the whole be good, and for a good purpose. The contrary appears only to those who apprehend but the present, as the beauty of an edifice is not manifest to one that sees but a small portion, as a stone, or plastering, or part of a wall ; but appears great to him who sees the whole and has leisure to make himself familiar with every part. We fear not therefore that what is accumulated in this world, by the vehemence of some wandering spirit, or the wrath of some thundering Jove, should be dispersed from this tomb or cupola of the sky, or be dissolved into powder beyond the starry firmament ; nor that the nature of things can otherwise come to be annihilated in substance, than as it seems to our eyes that the air contained in the cavity of a bubble becomes nothing when it bursts ; because we know that in a world in which everything succeeds another, there is no profoundest depth into which, as by the hand of an artificer, things are dissolved irreparably into nothing. There are no ends, limits, margins, or walls that defraud or subtract the infinite abundance of things. Thus the

earth is fertile, and so is the sea ; thus the perpetual brightness of the sun ; eternal fuel sustaining those devouring fires, and moisture the exhausted seas, from the infinite and ever renewed sustaining matter. Thus Democritus and Epicurus, who asserted the infinity of things, renewing and restoring, were nearer to a right conception than those who imagined the reverse." The Introduction concludes with a fine sonnet, from which we have not space to quote here.

We have dealt at some length upon the *Infinito Universo e Mondi*, because of all Bruno's Italian works it best shows how far he anticipated modern science. The Latin works, *De Monade*, *De Immenso*, are substantially a reproduction of *Della Causa* and *Della Infinito*, not merely repeating the same philosophical and scientific conceptions, but portraying the same condition of mind to which we have already alluded : an intense mystical rapture which raises him entirely above fear of death or earthly misfortune, and makes us feel that the subjective happiness within him must almost have atoned for the strokes of his untoward fortune. His relationship to Leibnitz is best seen in his work, *De Monade*.

We need not dwell at any length upon the two works of Bruno, next in order in Wagner's edition, *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante* and the *Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo*, the first of which is an extremely able though somewhat heavy allegory, written in the style of the period. It is dedicated to Sidney, and satirizes the various vices of the day under the guise of astronomical personifications. The *Cavallo* satirizes that piety which refuses all honest inquiry and original investigation. To the *Cavallo* is added, as a sort of continuation, a very short work of only five pages, called *Asino Cillenico*. Indeed the "ass," as a representation of human stupidity, was a favourite metaphor with Bruno, and meets us in many of his works. The next and last work in Wagner's edition, is that called *Gli Eroici Furori*—a work of much beauty, and interesting to us not so much for any philosophical or scientific conception it puts forth, but rather as an autobiographical revelation descriptive of that mystical rapture to which we have already alluded.

The *Eroici Furori* is dedicated to Philip Sidney in a somewhat lengthy preface, in which Bruno draws a comparison between the attractions of sensual love and those of the divine Muse which enchains himself. At the end of the preface, as if moved by some compunction lest he may have spoken

* Bruno frequently describes worlds as if he considered them to be animated beings ; the larger he calls *divinities*, the smaller *animals*.

too contemptuously of women, there is a sonnet written in praise of the beautiful and virtuous women he met with while in England. The work itself is in two parts, each part being divided into five dialogues.* It is freely interspersed with numerous sonnets, opening with one invoking his muse to come to his aid and inspire him with all high thoughts. Many of these sonnets are of extreme beauty. *Eroici Furori*, or Heroic Love, really means with Bruno an intense longing for divine wisdom and love for spiritual beauty. And it is impossible to read the sonnets of which this work is so largely composed without apprehending the sublime inward vision by which he is inspired. He conceives himself freed from the trammels of the flesh, unclogged even by the power of gravity, breasting the air at will; bounding through space from world to world, from system to system, gaining with each progress fuller knowledge of the One Sole Cause of All. For if Infinite Space is illimitable, Infinite Being must surely be without limits also. His religious standpoint was, therefore, distinctly pantheism. It is sometimes said that there is but a step between atheism and pantheism, and logically perhaps this is so; but emotionally the difference is immense, and religious feeling pertains to the emotion. The atheist believes that there is no God but Nature; the pantheist conceives the whole of Nature to be but a manifestation of God. No one can read this *Eroici Furori* without seeing that it is a work distinctly of religious aspiration. Nay, if we except such of his writings as are satires we may describe all Bruno's works to be of this nature. His spiritual ideal and divine object receives, it is true, different names at different times. Now she is "Sophia or Wisdom," now his "one beloved lady," now "mia diva;" but through all her various guises we are made to feel with Bruno himself that all these attempts at nomenclature are but provisional and inadequate definitions of that which is beyond human conception, much less human definition.

We have sometimes thought that in their essential natures the poet Shelley has more in common with Bruno than any other writer with whom we are acquainted. In each there is the same spiritual exaltation, the same intensity of religious feeling, strangely contrasted with absence of belief in religious dogma; there is the same hatred of shams and hypocrisy; the same passionate ardour for truth; there is even the same

contempt for pedagogues, and dislike to university life. But in Shelley was developed a far larger amount of feeling for the woes and sins of humanity, which makes him at once greater and lesser than Bruno. It made his teaching too iconoclastic and destructive, while that of Bruno was mainly constructive. Shelley warred against all religion, Bruno against the shams and make-believes of religion. Shelley hated both legal and religious restraint, all that interfered with the freedom, and, as he thought, happiness of man. Bruno only wanted sufficient freedom to worship in his own way the divine Mistress which enchained him; in the service of whom and in the proclamation of whose beauty he could be as iconoclastic as Shelley himself; and for her he was ready to sacrifice both life and liberty. But all religion that was honestly held—so long as it interfered not with a belief in the infinity of worlds—had nothing but consideration from him. He declares that though there is but one Truth, there are many ways leading to that one Truth. And consistently with this declaration he was on terms of warm affection with the Catholic Castelnau, equally with the Protestant Sidney. He was one of the very few in his day capable of admiring persons of an alien religion, so long only as that religion was honestly held. Thus intellectually he dissented more from the Lutheran doctrine than any other, because of the preference it professed for faith rather than works, declaring that such a doctrine partook of the nature of *deform* rather than *reform*; yet for the Lutherans, considered as a body, he had much respect, simply because he could see that they were genuine in their beliefs. Thus where Shelley would probably have held that religion was made for man and not man for religion, and that all religions were only to be considered good in so far as they made man better, Bruno held that the worship of the Infinite One should be a supreme object with man, and in his *Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast* he traces the resemblance that there is in all religions, and shows that beneath superficial diversities the aim and object of all is essentially the same—viz., the contemplation and worship of the Ineffable. Thus, the improvement of man was to Shelley what the adoration of God was to Bruno; yet even here Bruno so far agrees with Shelley that in his *Spaccio* and elsewhere he pronounces those laws to be best, whether secular or religious, that give to the best actions the best encouragement. The slight difference between them lies not so much in

* The first part has been translated into English by L. Williams, under the title of *The Heroic Enthusiasts*.

the essential natures of the two men as in the different periods in which each was born. The *Zeit-Geist* of Bruno's day was the new revelation of the solar system and of the movement and position of the earth. Humanity, its rights and duties and privileges, filled the foremost place of thought in the time of Shelley; and it was natural that, living when he did, the woes and miseries of mankind should have pressed themselves upon him so acutely. Yet in spite of this diversity of aims, we can scarcely read the works of the two poets consecutively and with care without perceiving the very real similarity there is between them. Let him who has just risen from a study of Bruno's *Infinito Universo e Mondi* begin the *Adonais* of Shelley, or his *Alastor*, and he will see that the spiritual conception in each is almost identical. Or let him study certain of the sonnets in the *Eroici Furori*, and fully realize Bruno's imaginative representation of himself, freed from all earthly trammels, breasting space and absorbed in the contemplation of the Infinite around him, and then read *Queen Mab*, whom Shelley represents as led by a Fairy or Spirit, seated in a wondrous chariot, which seemed to fly

"Through the midst of an immense concave
Radiant with million constellations, tinged
With shades of infinite colour,
And semi-circled with a belt,
Flashing incessant meteors.

* * * * *

"The magic car moved on,
Earth's distant orb appeared
The smallest light that twinkles in the heaven;
While round the chariot's way
Innumerable systems widely rolled,
And countless spheres diffused
An ever varying glory.

* * * * *

"Spirit of Nature! here,
In this interminable wilderness
Of worlds, at whose immensity
Even soaring fancy staggers—
Here is thy fitting temple.
Yet not the lightest leaf
That quivers to the passing breeze
Is less instinct with thee;
Yet not the meanest worm
That lurks in graves and fattens on the dead
Less shares thy eternal breath.
Spirit of Nature! thou!
Imperishable as this scene,
Here is thy fitting temple."

No one, we think, could read the works of the two poets even superficially without seeing the very real resemblance in the spirit pervading them; no one could read a little more deeply without perceiving also the difference engrafted on the similarity by the spirit of the time. It is enough for

Bruno to hope that infinite worlds are filled with inhabitants capable of worshipping the Ineffable. Shelley dreads lest these inhabitants may suffer from the woes and sorrows that afflict humanity.

We must return from this digression to that point where we last left off in our sketch of Bruno's travels.

In 1585 Bruno left England for a second visit to Paris; thence to Mayence, Marburg, and Wittenberg. He received better treatment in Wittenberg than in his other resting-places, and consequently remained there two years. On March 8, 1588, he pronounced a grateful valedictory oration before the University of Wittenberg; unfortunately too long for quotation here. From Wittenberg he went to Prague; thence to Helmstedt, where he met with a fate now almost habitual to him—viz., attracting warm admiration and favour from the reigning princes, while incurring virulence from the theologians and pedagogues. Boethius, the Pastor of the Evangelical Church, solemnly excommunicated him.

Frankfort was Bruno's next resting-place. It was the centre of the German book trade; and Italian booksellers, and indeed booksellers from various parts of Europe, attended the Easter and Michaelmas fairs held at Frankfort. Bruno would have liked to find a lodging in the house of the great printer, Wechel; but he was gradually becoming a marked character, and Wechel evidently feared to run the risk of sheltering him. Somewhat strangely he found ready admission in the convent of the Carmelites. It was here in Frankfort that Bruno sent his four Latin works, *On the Threefold Minimum*, *On the Monad*, *On Immensity*, and *On the Composition of Images, Signs and Ideas*, to press. Early in 1591 Bruno suddenly left Frankfort, and had the imprudence to revisit Italy. His country had always been warmly beloved by him, and he was probably only too glad to avail himself of a slight incident as an excuse for revisiting it. This incident was nothing more important than the fact that a book written by him—possibly a work alluding to the art of Lully—had fallen into the hands of Ciotto, a somewhat eminent Venetian bookseller, who had shown it to a young Italian nobleman belonging to the distinguished family of the Mocenigos. Giovanni or Zuane Mocenigo shared to a certain extent the love of learning common to his family, and probably possessed also the love of the marvellous, and a leaning to the occult so prevalent in his age. A glance at the book seems to have inspired him with

the hope that Bruno would be able to impart to him much that he was desirous to learn; and Bruno received in consequence the flattering intimation that Mocenigo was anxious to become acquainted with him. Still, this little incident, though it probably formed an additional reason for Bruno's sudden departure from Frankfort, could scarcely have been the true cause, since he was eight months on his road—staying at Zurich and Padua—before visiting Venice. From the moment that he entered Venice fate was preparing her toils for him. He first took a lodging, so as to instruct Mocenigo, though he still frequently returned to Padua in order to give private lessons to certain German students residing at the University. Then in March, 1592, he became an intimate of Mocenigo's house on the Grand Canal. From that time his fate was sealed. Mocenigo became at first disappointed, and afterwards irritated, that Bruno did not impart that occult knowledge so ardently desired by him. Bruno very probably, with his known imprudence, did not disguise the contempt he felt towards the superstitions and pedantries of his age. Then Mocenigo, unable to divest himself of his preconceived conception of Bruno's acquaintance with occult matters, threatened him with the Inquisition if he would not impart what Mocenigo still thought he was only keeping back from some motives of his own. Bruno answered contemptuously that he "had no fear of the Inquisition; yet, as he seemed to be giving no satisfaction to his patron, he was quite willing to pack up his things and leave." While the unfortunate Neapolitan was preparing for his departure, his patron, probably dreading that Bruno might spread abroad more of his superstitious feelings than he cared to have publicly made known, secretly betrayed him to the Inquisition. His denunciations are in the form of three letters, too lengthy to be given here; but they will be found in Bert's *Documenti intorno a Giordano Bruno*,* and they are dated severally May 23, 25, and 29, 1592. In them Mocenigo accuses Bruno of being possessed of the devil, of being an enemy to Christ, and of various philosophical and heretical opinions, some of which he probably held, but the majority of which were undoubtedly perversions. Thus, where he makes Bruno lament that "the Church in these days does not deal with men as the Apostles dealt, for they converted the people by preaching and

good example, but now the Catholic Church takes men by violence and not by love," Mocenigo was probably quite accurate in his statement. Again, when he represents Bruno as holding the Catholic faith to be higher than all other forms of dogmatic beliefs, he is again probably correct. Bruno did not hold very strongly to any stated form of faith, thinking that a good life was of far more importance than any mere set of doctrines; yet he never entirely shook himself free from a certain affection towards the religion long endeared to him by ancestry and the environment of his childhood, unsparing though he was towards the hypocrisies of the religious world during his later life. But when Mocenigo represented Bruno as denouncing Christ as *un tristo*, a sorry or contemptible fellow, assuredly he accused him of opinions which he never uttered, and which he indignantly repudiated.

On the 24th of May Bruno was conveyed to the prisons of the Holy Office, and on the following day Mocenigo took his oath of confirmation before the Father Inquisitor. The trial at once began. Ciotto and another Venetian bookseller, Bertano, were both examined, the one on the 26th, the other on the 29th of May. Both agreed in saying that Bruno had never uttered a word in their presence against Christianity or the Catholic Church. Then Bruno himself was examined, detailing at length the circumstances of his life. When asked the question, "What things are necessary to salvation?" he answered emphatically, "Faith, hope, and charity." Asked if he had any enemy, he replied bitterly, "My only enemy is Ser Giovanni Mocenigo, who threatened my life and my honour, and that continually." Yet it is probable that the numerous onslaughts made by Bruno upon pedagogues and theologians in different parts of Europe, together with his praise of various Lutheran sovereigns, may, unconsciously to himself, have brought him many enemies. On the 23rd of June Andrea Morosini, the distinguished historian, was called upon to give his evidence. Bruno had been in the habit of attending his literary and political assemblies. Upon being asked his opinion of Bruno's religious belief, Morosini answered that in his hearing Bruno had never touched upon religion, and added that had he thought him other than a good Catholic he would never have permitted him to enter his assemblies.

Etiquette between Venice and Rome caused a certain delay in Bruno's trial, but on the 7th January, 1593, he was officially delivered over to the Inquisition at Rome,

* An English translation is given in the recent *Life of Bruno*, by I. Fritch, published in Trübner's *Philosophical Series*, pp. 262-265.

and on the 27th entered those gloomy prisons in which the seven remaining years of his life were to be spent. From the beginning of 1593 to the beginning of 1599 Bruno was kept in suspense from day to day, not knowing when sentence was to be delivered. It is difficult at first sight to account for a delay so unnecessary, and which must have added so greatly to his punishment, but probably indecision on the part of the Pope, and not pure cruelty, lay at the root of it. It was not easy for the Inquisition to point to any particular action or written opinion that would justify it in executing Bruno. Such satires and invectives as appeared in some of his less worthy writings he was perfectly willing to recant, frankly regretting that he should have written them. All his nobler and more important works he declares, and with evident sincerity, to be free from the faintest imputation upon the Church.* But the Inquisition was probably more logical than Bruno in perceiving that, if his opinions once found acceptance, some of the most important doctrines of the Church would be in danger. Thus, the Copernican doctrine, of which he was so fervent an apostle, was certainly against the Mosaic account of creation; though, as Bruno pointed out, it was favoured by the Book of Job. Again, his doctrine of the mutability of all things, their transformation, the unity that underlies variety, the majesty and harmony of eternal law, may, as he avers, find support in the writer of Ecclesiastes, but they are certainly against miraculous interpositions and the intercessions of saints. Yet it was indirectly rather than directly that the real danger of Bruno's works lay. Explicitly and implicitly he had attacked all superstitious worship of authority. And authority was the life-blood of the Church. He was no blatant iconoclast wishing to hew down all that was sacred with time. But he lived in an age when reverence for mere authority choked all higher reverence, even that for truth itself; when it acted as a putrefying influence, contaminating innocuous things; while it rendered that which was essentially corrupt of tenfold greater corruption.

We who are living in an age which is reaping the fruits of Bruno's teaching can hardly realize how insidious and widespread was this worship of authority. Yet, in our opinion, Bruno's claim to be remembered

by posterity lies not so much in the scientific discoveries he helped to effect, great as these were, as in his courage to proclaim them. He was one of the very few in his day to perceive that a question can only be judged on its own merits, and that it is impossible to arrive at those merits without free and untrammelled discussion. Yet it was just this freedom of discussion that the Church had always forbidden. And, though she took seven years to arrive at the decision, she was probably only showing her customary astuteness in judging that Bruno's writings, innocent as the author himself judged them to be, must prove a source of real danger to her.

At intervals during the year 1599 attempts were made by the Inquisition to induce Bruno to recant, but he answered that he had nothing more to recant, nor knew he what he should recant. On the 8th, or according to some authorities on the 9th, of February, 1600, he was conducted from his prison to the presence of his judges to hear his sentence pronounced while he was made to kneel. After being degraded as an impenitent heretic, he was sentenced to be burnt alive. He only answered, "It may be that you are more afraid to deliver this judgment than I to receive it." On the 17th of February, clad in a *san benito*, on which flames and devils were painted, he was led to the stake in the Campo dei Fiori. A crucifix was offered him; he refused to look upon it. It might be that his long imprisonment and his cruel sentence had had the effect of exciting in him an antipathy to the Catholic Church that he had not previously felt. Then the pile was set alight. It is recorded by an eye-witness that he did not utter a cry. His ashes were collected, and soon all that was mortal of Giordano Bruno was scattered to the winds.

As there has been an attempt of late to cast doubts upon the fact of Bruno's execution—an attempt not simply confined to the Catholic party, but that has even found its way into so useful a publication as the new edition of *Chambers's Encyclopædia*—we think it well to relate the various proofs there are which seem to us to make Bruno's execution as much a matter of certainty as any historical fact not within actual human memory can be. The proofs are as follows:—

1. A letter from Scioppius giving a full and detailed account of the execution of Bruno, which took place in the presence of Scioppius himself on the 17th of February, 1600. This letter, it must be admitted,

* That Bruno had doubts upon some of the tenets of the Church, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, seems certain. But (to use his own words) when thus expressing himself he wrote "as a philosopher, not as a theologian;" a mode of defence less alien to the conscience of that period than it would be to our own. In his nobler works, however, he seldom touched upon doctrinal matters.

was not published till 1620, but still Sciopius did not die for some time after that date, and a forgerer would hardly have dared to circulate a letter written by him and bearing his name, if not genuine, during his lifetime.*

2. Mersenne, in his book called *Impiété des Deistes*, printed in 1624, speaks of Bruno as "un athée brûlé en Italie."

3. Wachter, the Imperial ambassador at Rome 1600, mentioned the fact of Bruno's death to Kepler. (See Correspondence of Kepler and Brengger, first printed in 1858.)

4. The *Avvisi di Roma*, contained in the manuscripts of the Vatican (a sort of newspaper of those days), of the 19th of February 1600, records Bruno's execution as having taken place on the previous Thursday, the 17th.

5. The *Archives of San Giovanni Decolato*, containing a notice of the execution in all its details. The day of the week is said to be Thursday, the year 1600; but the day of the month is erroneously stated to be the 16th instead of the 17th, as it should be.

THE PASTORAL LETTER OF THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP.

From *The Freeman's Journal*.

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, BALTIMORE,
September 7, 1889.

*To the Clergy, Secular and Regular, of the
Archdiocese of Baltimore :*

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN : It is inherent in the nature of men of principle to fly to the rescue of those who are unjustly assailed. Our feelings, on such an occasion, are a mixture of sympathy with the victim, and of indignation at the aggressor. Such sympathy and such wrath are a measure of the nobility of one's nature. Our arms instinctively go forth toward the blow, or if too late, our voices rise in loud protest.

And such a mingled feeling of righteous wrath and deep sympathy has of late been bred in every Catholic, as it should in every Christian heart, when the news came to us that upon a public square, in the city of Rome, upon the solemn Feast of Pentecost, impious men dared to unveil the statue of an apostate monk to the admiration and veneration of the thousands then and there assembled. Dragging the memory of a wild

theorizer, a shameless writer, and denier of the divinity of Christ from the obscurity of a grave that had for three centuries closed upon its disgrace, these men, backed by mere brute force, have set upon a pedestal in the Holy City the statue of the infamous Bruno.

Such a proceeding is a palpable and flagrant outrage, not alone upon the Catholic, but upon the whole Christian world. It is a long-pondered, deliberately planned and well-aimed blow at all that is sound and wholesome in religion and morals. Its animus is clear from the selection of time and place, and the unchristian and defiant language employed in the unveiling of a statue of a man whose whole life breathed cowardice, pride and defiance of lawfully constituted authority. Upon the commemoration of that first great event, when the Holy Spirit of God descended into the hearts and intellects of men, these miscreants, in their blasphemous arrogance, have repudiated all dependence upon any higher power, vainly attempting to deify human reason. They have contemptuously cast off the sweet yoke of Christ. In their frantic efforts after misplaced freedom they have spurned the truth which alone could make them free.

Theirs is not the action of decent, honorable but misguided men, calmly, and with due regard to the feelings of others, promulgating a new belief, or introducing a new cult. Their attempt, as has been observed, is not so much to honor Bruno, their newly discovered martyr, as to insult and vilify the Vicar of Jesus Christ and his devoted children throughout Christendom. Indeed, their aim is higher still; they defy and insult not alone His Vicar, but Our Divine Lord Himself. From every land they have chosen as the committee to further the movement the champions of atheism, the would-be destroyers of the very foundations of Christianity. The orator of the occasion openly declared that the event of that day dealt a blow at the spiritual sovereignty of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Such a demonstration was appropriately closed by the enacting of an infamous play, written by the new saint of the worship of free thought.

It is proper, dearly beloved brethren, that the Christian world, and especially this portion, where the term "religious freedom" is understood, in a sober, Christian sense, should brand with their indignant scorn action such as this. We are not, thanks be to God, yet ready for processions in which the red and the black flags of revolutionists and anarchists are defiantly flaunted.

Furthermore, as devoted and faithful

* In the October number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1885, Mr. R. C. Christie has stated at length the numerous proofs there are in support of the genuineness of this letter.

children, we owe to our Holy Father, an emphatic and unmistakable expression of deep sympathy with him in the indignities put upon him. Above all, the plain duty of expiation rests upon us, when from a city illuminated by the teachings of the Apostles, sanctified by the spotless lives and heroic deeds of virgins and confessors, reddened by the blood of countless martyrs, there now go up blasphemies against the Most High God.

You will, therefore, at all the Masses, until further notice, recite the collect *Pro Quocunque Necessitate*, and, beginning with Monday, September 16th next, inclusively, you will conduct in your respective parishes a solemn Triduum of Expiation, with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament after Mass, the *O Salutaris* being immediately followed by the "Litany of the Saints."

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

P. J. DONAHUE, Chancellor.

ROMANISM AND SECULARISM.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

It is pitiable to be obliged to recognize the evil alliance which has existed between the Romanists and the secularists in the matter of the public schools. These two deadly enemies have played, and are still playing, into each other's hands in a way which will produce results that one of the parties assuredly does not contemplate. It has ever been the misfortune of Rome, with all her faculty of organization and government, that she is prone to sacrifice the interests of the future for the sake of temporary success. If she had chosen at the time of the Reformation to put herself at the head of the movement for the advancement of learning, she might have controlled its direction, and a moderately reformed Church might have retained the spiritual command of the Christian world. To have taken that course, however, would have implied concessions mortifying to the vanity of popes and cardinals, and a haughty "we cannot" became the abdication of pontifical power in the Gothic nations of Europe. Another misfortune of Rome is her willingness to make alliances with any power or any party which for the moment serves her turn. When she has used the tool of the moment, she assumes that she will have the power to throw it away; and many a time has she found that the poor tool of a moment has become an enemy to reckon with.

In this country, if the Church of Rome had been really sagacious, and had really believed that she is to be the Church of this continent, she would never have waged war on the public schools. She would assuredly not have faulted them for teaching a modicum of Christianity. She would have praised and supported them, and would have made herself the special champion of their religious character. By so doing, she would have made sure that in those schools nothing would be taught to which she could object, and when she gained sufficient power, she might have hoped to secure still larger influence in controlling the religious teaching of the schools. At last, if her adherents should become a majority of the people, as the logical consequence of the principles she had professed and the conduct she had pursued, she would have obtained entire control of the school system.

To have taken this sagacious course would have required a temporary self-restraint of which Rome is very rarely capable. For the moment she would have had to submit; and to Rome, even for a moment, submission is intolerable. When she cannot rule, she prefers to ruin; and in working the ruin of that which she cannot rule, she delights to use her bitterest enemies as the agents of her will. In her warfare on the public schools her chief ally has been the so-called secularists, whose dream is to banish God, not only from the schools, but from the thoughts of men. The secularists in this matter were wiser than their Romish allies. They readily took up the Romish cry that the reading of the Bible in the public schools was a violation of the rights of conscience, but they very soon went on to insist that any religious teaching, or observance in schools maintained by the State is a wrong *per se*, since the State represents only secular interests, and has no mandate from the people to teach any religion.

Then Rome began loudly to cry that the public schools are godless schools, and that Christians may not lawfully send their children to godless schools. Roman Catholic Christians must therefore have their own schools, utterly apart from the control of the State.

So, then, the result is that the public school system has come to be conducted according to secularist principles. It has become, or certainly, at least, it is rapidly becoming, the acknowledged principle of public school education that it shall be exclusively secular.

Thus, Rome has raised up an enemy against herself, and has entrenched him in

an impregnable position ; and now she comes demanding that the State, which may not allow religion to be taught in her own schools, shall pay Roman Catholic priests, monks and nuns to teach religion in theirs ! Does Rome expect her demand to be conceded ? Undoubtedly ; and in a few places she is right in that expectation. But not in many, nor for long. The American people, trained in the doctrine of the secularists, will not fail to apply that doctrine consistently ; and every case in which it is violated in favor of Rome will only the more surely arouse the temper of the people against the power which seeks to overthrow American principles. In other words, whereas it was in the power of Rome to become the champion, and in many ways ultimately the mistress of public education, she has deliberately handed public education over to secularism, and entrenched the bitterest enemy of all religion in the very heart of the nation. When the time of reckoning comes—and it will come—Rome will yet feel the effects of her prodigious folly.

DR. SHEDD ON REVISION.

BY HENRY DAY.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

In an article published in the *Evangelist* September 5th, Dr. Shedd has advocated the non-revision of the Confession of Faith. When such a theologian and dialectician has spoken, it would appear as if further discussion were vain. But we are impressed with the fact that Dr. Shedd looks at the question at issue from one standpoint, and many of us from quite another. He speaks from the professor's chair the views of the astute logician ; the master of dogmatic theology, to whose mind the difficulties of our creed are familiar, as one who has for years taught, explained, and defended the doctrines of the Confession, and who is more or less committed to them. There is another large class in our Church not so cultured and not so committed, who take the language of the Confession in its plain and ordinary sense, and who cannot with the same facility reason away the apparent difficulties which meet them in the Confession. I think this latter class are not convinced by the arguments of Dr. Shedd.

My observation of this discussion goes to show that it has developed two general classes : one against revision, embracing many learned professors, who have devoted

their lives to teaching, explaining, and defending the Confession in its totality, and who naturally adhere to it, and embracing also others who are averse to change from natural temperament, and who cling with a kind of blind reverence to these true, honored symbols of a Church of no mean historic fame. The other class embraces those who come more in contact with the members of the Church and the needs of the world ; and the great body of laymen, who take common-sense and practical views of the questions at issue. These two classes are the Conservatives and the Liberals, who have appeared in all ages on every great question affecting the progress of man in politics, religion, and all social questions. The arguments of the Conservatives are : the Confession is a monument of piety and wisdom, venerable for its historic associations. The Church has prospered under it. It is broad and liberal, and affords great liberty of interpretation. It is dangerous to begin amendment, for you cannot see the end ; or to make explanations, for they must be explained, and will introduce new difficulties. " Let us work on the same old bases, in the same straight lines, and let well enough alone. All Presbyterians are Calvinists, or ought to be, and the Confession is Calvinism at high-water mark." These are the arguments of our Conservative friends for non-revision. But they do not satisfy the Liberals. In their view they do not reach the real issue. The issue in their minds is this—viz., the Confession of Faith in some of its statements is *wrong*. There is *error* in it, and this error is *vital*, that there are statements in regard to important doctrines which are not " expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence deduced therefrom" (chap. 1, sec. 6). By far the most important of these alleged errors is contained in chap. 3, sections 2, 3, 4, and 7. The essence of the objection, is that the language of these sections gives a false view of the character of God ; that the ordinary meaning of the language, taken by itself and in its mildest sense, represents Him a cold, isolated, indifferent Sovereign, and in a very common and probable meaning, as a malevolent tyrant devoid of mercy, justice, and love, dooming millions of souls by the sweep of His awful decrees, before their existence and without reference to their sin, to everlasting death. They believe this view of the character of God is logically carried through the Confession, and leads to other doctrines therein stated, which are equally repulsive to Christian impulse. It admits

the possible damnation of infants. It states directly the universal condemnation of all souls to whom God has not revealed Christ, however much they are striving and feeling after God, and ordering their lives according to the best light God has given them (chap. 10, sec. 4), and denies the efficacy of the blood of Christ to save them. This latter class regard these as great and vital errors, or at least doctrines not proven; that they entirely change the character of our religion from that which appears on every page of the New Testament. They do not believe them; they repel them as a libel on the God we love, and on the administration of His government over His creatures. The advocates of revision say these errors do exist, and that they are vital, and if so, they ought to be eliminated from the Confession, and that there is no room for argument about the expediency of revision in such a case. Vital error should have no place in a religious creed. The adherents of non-revision are bound to address themselves first to this point, namely, to prove from the Bible, or by necessary deduction therefrom, that there is no error in the Confession in the parts above stated. The laymen particularly wish to see these points fairly discussed, and Bible truths applied to them.

We think the burden of proof is fairly upon those who oppose revision to show affirmatively that these doctrines are fairly deduced from Scripture. The Confession implies as much (chap. 1, sec. 6). If such is the real issue—the truth or error of the Confession on the points above named—it will be seen that the arguments of our Conservative friends which I have repeated above, do not reach the real issue. They do not prove that the Confession is without error.

Let us bring Dr. Shedd's arguments to bear on this main issue of no error in the Confession. All his arguments are that it is *inexpedient* to revise, which implies that there is no substantial error, which is the question at issue.

1. Because existing forms have well met the needs of the Church. If we admit this, does it prove that the Confession is without error? It may have done all this, and we claim it has done it in *spite* of errors. God overrules errors in Church and State, so that good may come out of evil. The Constitution of the United States did a mighty work even while the taint of slavery was upon it. What engrossed the theological mind in 1647, and met the needs of the Church, does not satisfy the demands of the Church in 1889. In 1553 Calvin con-

demned Servetus to the stake, and the gentle Melancthon approved the sentence; and this intolerance prevailed more or less among reformed Christians for a whole century after. This does not prove it to be right.

2. Dr. Shedd says revision is inexpedient because the reunion of the two divisions of the Church was founded on the Confession as it stands. Suppose it was, does this show that there was no error in the Confession before the division in 1837, and since the reunion in 1869? It does not reach the real issue. We assert the fact to be that the errors have existed during all this period, but the time had not arrived in the providence of God, or in the mind of the Church, to assert the errors and take a stand against them. Under this second head, Dr. Shedd would have us believe that the Confession brought the divided Church together. This cannot be so. The Confession of the Church before division in 1837, during the division till 1869, for both churches, and after reunion, was the same. As the Confession did not cause division, it did not cause reunion. Neither party changed its relation to the Confession by reunion. The most that can be said on this point, is that the Confession being the same in both Churches, it did not stand in the way of reunion, as different creeds would have done. The cause of reunion was the blessed influence of Christian love, and the desire for Christian union.

3. Dr. Shedd says "Revision will introduce new difficulties; explanations will need to be explained." Again this does not meet the issue. It does not show that the alleged errors in the Confession do not exist. It rather *assumes* that errors do not exist, but that truths are so blindly stated as to require explanation. Dr. Shedd asserts that the Presbyterian Board has issued a large and valuable library of books, expounding and explaining the Confession. It seems proper to say that a Church having nearly a million of communicants of as intelligent people as exist on the earth, but embracing all classes and conditions of men, should have a creed which they are expected to understand and to teach to their children; so clearly stated and so much in consonance with the spirit and general trend of Bible truth, that no labored treatises would be required to understand it, or to commend it to the consciences of Christian people. Dr. Shedd has brought forward for illustration the doctrine of the decrees of God, to show how explanations will need to be explained. In elaborating this illustration, the learned professor has

gone to the very heart of the difficulty of those who demand revision. His argument here is that there is no error in the Confession in regard to God's decrees. Here the issue is squarely met. If we understand him, he believes that by the decree of God for the manifestation of His own glory (and for no other reason, and without any reference to their sin); some men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death, and that these angels and men thus foreordained, were particularly and unchangeably designed to everlasting death (not punishment). That the reason for this *foreordination* (Dr. Shedd calls it *non-election*), is "sovereign, secret, and unconditional."

If I understand the logic, it is that God as a Sovereign in past eternity, as His choice and for His glory, and therefore for His pleasure, without any reference to the conduct of His creatures, by an affirmative act of His will divided all men into these two classes; and that He would have made the same decree, if it were possible that He could not have foreseen what should come to pass in the future (chap. 3, sec. 2).

If this be the doctrine of the Confession, I feel bound to say I do not believe it, but abhor it. It justifies the language of a director in Princeton Theological Seminary, who said to me "Every time I read the chapter on the decrees, it makes me shudder." According to this doctrine, if God's decrees to everlasting death were unconditional and without reference to sin, but for His own glory, then if man had not fallen, still the non-elect would have existed, and would have gone to their final doom of everlasting death, and that without sin.

It seems to me that the sections 2, 3, 4, and 7 of chapter 3 of the Confession lead to this enormity and absurdity. Dr. Shedd has squarely met the issue here, and we are glad the discussion has opened here on its merits. We hope some of our theologians skilled in dogmatics will follow up this discussion till the whole Church shall awake, read, think, and decide for themselves. We have only given the opinions of a layman, formed by taking the plain language of the Confession and comparing the same with the whole drift of the New Testament on the boundless love of God and the fulness of His grace in Christ.

We think the whole atmosphere pervading the Confession in regard to the character of God is chilling and repulsive; while that of the New Testament is full of genial warmth, tenderness, and love. Our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount thrice calls God "*your Heavenly Father*." The Confes-

sion not once calls Him *our Father*. The Apostle John twice in one chapter sums up His character in that one sentence—God is Love. The Confession, one of whose objects is to teach us what to believe concerning God, sums up His character as a Sovereign ruling the universe for His pleasure only. The Westminster divines seemed to delight in condemning souls to eternal death. I mean that where there seemed any doubt about the divine clemency in salvation, they always gave the doubt against the creature. They went on the theory that all were lost unless they could prove affirmatively from Scripture, their salvation. We think the creed should have been constructed on the theory that the horrors of eternal death should be affirmed of none except those of whom it is clearly affirmed in the teachings of Christ and His Apostles. The former theory seems to limit the Atonement of Christ; the latter to allow full scope for the efficacy of His blood to save to the uttermost.

Dr. Shedd's fifth point is that revision is inexpedient because it *may* abridge the liberty of interpretation. We may say with equal reason, it *may* not. If there is error in the Confession, we had better make the attempt to eliminate it. This will not abridge any liberty we now have, to believe all that is true. As an illustration, Dr. Shedd brings forward that other doctrine of the Confession, of non-elect infants, and he admits that now there is *liberty* under the Confession to believe in the damnation of infants, although he does not so believe. Here again the real question at issue is brought up. Dr. Shedd approves of this liberty to so believe, or to believe the contrary. The advocates for revision take the ground that all infants are saved, and that none should believe the contrary. This question ought to be settled by affirmative declarations of Scripture, or necessary deductions therefrom. Every Christian instinct dictates that the silence of Scripture on this subject should be interpreted in favor of infants. On the contrary, the Confession takes the silence of Scripture against the infants, and leaves some of them to the doom of death eternal. This liberty under the Confession to believe in the damnation of infants, we trust the great body of the Church will declare an error. The truth is, there are some essential and vital doctrines in which there should be no liberty. Our creed should not allow any liberty of interpretation in regard to the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, or His atonement for sin; and we should be glad to see the day when

the Presbyterian Church will so alter its creed as not to allow a belief in the condemnation of any infants.

Dr. Shedd's sixth argument is that Revision is inexpedient, because the Confession as it now reads is a sufficiently broad and liberal creed for any Calvinist who professes a precise form of doctrine. Here again, we say, the question is not, Are we Calvinists? but, Is there error in the Confession? The argument is, because we are Calvinists we should not seek Revision. I am obliged to confess that I cannot clearly define what modern Calvinism is. I have not subscribed to Augustinianism or Calvinism, except what is found in the Confession. I find a constitutional provision in our Form of Government for changing our creed, which implies that the founders of the Church looked forward to the necessity of a change, and provided for it. I find that the creed has been already changed frequently, and one half of the work of the Westminster divines, viz., their Form of Government and Directory for Worship, has been discarded by our Church. How can it then be reasonably argued that further change of the Confession is inexpedient, and that we should "let the creed stand exactly as it was drawn up by the sixty-nine commissioners in five weekly sessions for nearly nine years."

Dr. Shedd in his seventh point states that Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Standards already make full provision for those exceptional cases on account of which Revision is claimed by its advocates to be needed. It is here assumed that Revision is demanded only to meet a few exceptional cases.

We answer, Revision is not mainly demanded for exceptional cases, but because of alleged grave and vital errors in the Confession, which should be removed. And in order to show that Revision is not expedient, it should be shown that these errors do not exist. After a full discussion of that question, and a declaration of the majority of the Church that there are no serious errors in the creed, then it will be proper to say to these exceptional cases who do not so think, that they are welcome to remain in our Church under protest. But do our Standards even now provide for these exceptional cases? It does receive to membership individuals who cannot adopt the Standards, but it will not receive that large class of young men desiring to enter the ministry, and many worthy men who are needed in the eldership, who cannot "cordially receive and adopt the Confession of

Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures."

Dr. Shedd calls the exceptional cases "babes in Christ," and asks "Why the whole Presbyterian Church should reverse its entire creed so as to make it fit these exceptional cases?" and "Why should the mountain go to Mahomet?" The answer to these questions, so sharply put, is this: We are trying to find out, by asking for Revision, which class is the mountain, and which is Mahomet.

If the advocates for Revision prevail, then Dr. Shedd will have to fall in with the followers of Mahomet, and come to the mountain. As we have the constitutional right to modify our creed, the advocates for Revision are hoping, by a fair trial, to show that they are not the exceptional class, the babes in Christ, who remain in the Church by sufferance. They believe the general sentiment of our Church and of all Presbyterian Churches in the world is moving in the direction of a revision of the Westminster Standards; that this movement is under the guidance of the Spirit of God, who has promised to guide His people into all truth; and that He has taught them much in the last two hundred and fifty years, which in every other respect have been the most eventful in the world's history for eighteen hundred years.

They cannot adopt the pessimistic view that the Church of this age cannot trust itself to discuss, modify, or adapt its creed to the wants of the present time, but must rely on the Westminster divines living two hundred and fifty years ago to think for them. As the Westminster divines improved on their predecessors, so they believe the broader culture, the wider experience of this age, can improve on the work of those truly great, but not inspired men.

It is to be hoped that our clergy, who, I believe, by their culture, piety, and experience have better qualifications to formulate a creed for the Church than any such class in any age have had, will discuss these great questions boldly and calmly on their merits, and that they will, in the words of James S. Candlish, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the College of the Free Church of Scotland, Glasgow, "set forth a statement of the vital truths of Christianity in a form suited and intelligible to the mind of the present age, as the Westminster Confession in many of its parts has ceased to be" (*Independent*, September 15th, 1889); and also it is greatly to be desired that our lay members, especially the elders, will carefully examine the Confession of Faith,

and study its proof texts, and compare the doctrines, particularly of chaps. 3 and 10, with their Bibles, and think and reason on these great questions in such manner that they can intelligently vote upon them in Presbytery.

THE HOWLING DERVISHES.

BY REV. JOHN P. PETERS, PH.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL.

From *The Standard of the Cross and The Church*.

EVERY ONE has heard of the Howling Dervishes, and knows something about their religious services or performances. They are one of the regular sights of Constantinople. Their most important *tekkieh*, or cloister, is on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, at Scutari. Here they hold a service every Thursday afternoon at the hour of afternoon prayer, and here I visited them for the second time, two days since, under the guidance of the Rev. H. O. Dwight, well known to all who are interested in Christian missions in Turkey. To any thoughtful man such an exhibition cannot be a mere amusement; it is a study in religion, and as such full of lessons and warnings.

When we arrived the dervishes were seated on their sheepskins at the lower end of the railed inclosure, which occupies the larger part of the room, reciting their common prayers, a chapter of the Koran, the praises of Mohammed, of their founder (Rufa'ee, died 1182), and of former saints of the order. The old sheikh squatted alone at the other end of the room, facing them, with his back toward a small niche in the southwestern wall, which indicates the direction of Mecca. In and about this niche hung various weapons, axes, swords and knives, relics of deceased members, and formerly used for purposes of religious self-torture. Not very many years since the dervishes of this *tekke* were wont to burn themselves with hot irons, and cut and gash themselves with sharp weapons, as part of their religious ceremonial. Lane, in his "Modern Egyptians," tells of seeing dervishes of this order take into their mouths live coals, fan them there into a glow by their breath, roll them about with their tongues, and finally chew them up and swallow them while still at a red heat. A friend from the interior told me last year of a dervish who thrust a knife into himself in his presence. But such jugglery and self-torture in connection with

their religious rites is now prohibited, at Constantinople at least, and the weapons on the wall are merely relics of the past.

A number of framed texts were also hung about the room, mainly passages from the Mohammedan scriptures. To one side of the niche was a conspicuous tapestry banner with the name of "Ali" worked upon it double. It will be remembered that "Ali" and his sons, Hasan and Husein, are especially venerated by the heretical Shiite moslems of Persia and Irak, so that among them "Ali," the prophet's nephew and son-in-law, has practically taken precedence of the prophet himself. Persian Mohammedanism, while much more fanatical than the Islam of the orthodox Sunnite or Turkish type, has nevertheless a more mystical, less literal character, and exhibits in connection with this a tendency to pantheism. The same is true in a less degree of many of the more than thirty different orders of dervishes, and among others of the Rufa'ee, or Howling Dervishes, and consequently they also pay a special reverence to "Ali." The latter was the founder of one of the two congregations from which all the dervish orders are said to be descended, and, although the few utterances of his which have been preserved are of a decidedly practical and commonplace character, he has come to be regarded as the founder and patron of mystical and allegorical, as over against literal and legal Mohammedanism. The degree of sympathy with the Persian heresy, or heretical doctrines, varies in different orders. The Bektash dervishes, who have a *tekkieh* close to Robert College, at Rumeli Hissar, even go so far as to hold a memorial service for Hasan and Husein, the murdered sons of "Ali," akin to the Persian passion play, commemorative of their death. In general, as might be expected, the dervishes are not looked upon with favor by the authorized religious leaders and teachers, although some of the latter are members of dervish orders. To a certain extent the relations and functions of the two are the same as those of the priests and prophets in the pre-exilic Jewish Church. Like the old prophets, moreover, the dervishes enjoy a very high reputation among the people at large.

The object of the dervish is to attain to a mystical, spiritual communion with God, an end which he often seeks by grossly mechanical and physical means. His watchwords are obedience and love. As a part of the discipline necessary to the development of the higher life, he practices asceticism and even bodily torture. But in many im-

portant particulars his asceticism is different from the monasticism of Buddhism, Rome and Russia. Celibacy is not necessary, indeed all the sheikhs or abbots of whom I know are married, and in many orders the post of sheikh is hereditary. So also the other members of the order do not necessarily dwell together in the cloister, nor wear a distinctive dress; they are not obliged to forsake the ordinary avocations of life, and their connection with the order may be severed at will. As to their private life, one hears the same charges which were made so frequently against the monks of the middle ages, but it is especially the wandering beggar dervishes against whom these charges are made.

But to return to the service of the Howling Dervishes. After the initial prayers were completed, two of the more experienced brethren were selected by the sheikh as the ministers or servants of the occasion, and invested with black stoles in token thereof. A number of dervishes then stood up in line, the old sheikh took his place at one end, one singer, who was joined later by three or four more, squatted on a sheepskin in front of them, and the dancing and howling began. The songs sung were love songs, mystically interpreted of the love of the soul to God, exactly as the synagogue, and following it, part at least of the Christian Church, interpreted Solomon's Song (for which interpretation compare the headings of the chapters in our authorized version with the text of the poem itself). Similarly a mystic use is made of drinking songs, and intoxication is allegorically interpreted of spiritual ecstasy. The dervish idea is the idea of love of God, which is viewed in a one-sided, imperfect manner, and sought in ecstasy, rapture, passion, and abnormal excitement. As might be expected, the allegorical interpretation of love and intoxication has led in certain orders to abuses and abominations such as have stained the record of some sects of Christian mystics. So the Bektash dervishes are said to indulge in wild orgies in their *zikr*, or ritual, and especially they employ intoxicants and opium (*hasheesh*) to bring on the ecstasy. They interpret actual intoxication mystically, while the *Rufa'ee* and others merely put an allegorical interpretation upon songs about intoxication.

While these love songs were being sung the line of dervishes was grunting and snorting, for so only can these peculiar sounds be described, the Mohammedan formula, "There is no god but God," accompanying the words by a double movement of the

body, a swaying forward and backward, and a limping, stamping, side movement with the feet. Their motions and their utterances kept increasing in rapidity. The ministers relieved them of their outer robes, and provided them also with linen skull-caps in place of the turban or fez. Outsiders joined the performers and danced and howled as well and as long as they could; that so they might imbibe some of the spiritual afflatus. Two negroes took their places near the center of the line, whom, from their dexterity and endurance, we judged to be regular members of the order. Little children danced and howled in the center of the room, in imitation of their elders. Now and then some of the outside performers dropped out exhausted, but more always came in to take their places, so that with the excitement the numbers increased also. The peculiar limping character of this portion of the dance, accompanying the vehement shouting of the name of God, I am inclined to compare with the dance and prayer of the priests of Baal, 1 Kings 18:26 (the literal rendering of the last clause of which seems to be: "And they limped at the altar which had been made").

After the dancers had become sufficiently excited, at a given signal the limping, swaying movement stopped, and all began to bob very violently up and down without quite lifting their bare feet from the floor, flinging their heads wildly from side to side, often with hideous contortions of countenance and ecstatic grimaces. At the same time they uttered what seemed to be inarticulate sounds. This was ecstasy. The singers in front chanted even more wildly; a blind beggar who was bobbing up and down on the right of the line, shouted: "The gates of heaven," "Put love in him," "Do it with love," and other similar alleluias and fervid ejaculations; and the believers were greatly edified, but the unbelieving said that they were mad. In justice to the dervishes, by the way, I ought to add that they tried hard to suppress the alleluia beggar, and at length succeeded, reminding me ludicrously of a scene in New Haven when I saw Mr. Moody suppress a Methodist brother who persisted in interrupting his exhortation by encouraging ejaculations and glad alleluias.

But the alleluia beggar was not the only reminder of strange phenomena, some of them emphatically irrational, magical, or even heathen, which present themselves from time to time among so-called Christians. Almost the same form of excitation to religious ecstasy by means of violent

physical exercise occurs among the colored people of our own country. I have in mind at this moment a certain chapel in New Haven, Baptist, I think, where the worshippers used to take hold of the back of the seats in front of them and spring up and down, shouting religious catchwords the while, until they would fall back in a state of ecstatic exhaustion. At the same time others would march through the aisles, stamping, clapping their hands, singing hymns and uttering wild cries. How much choice is there between this and the service of the Howling Dervishes?

Again, the ecstatic state and the unintelligible cries reminded me, on the one hand, of some camp-meeting scenes which I have both seen and heard of, and on the other hand, as I have already hinted, of the "tongues" disturbance in the Corinthian Church, discussed and condemned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 12 : 14. There is here, too, the same magical power attributed to the mere utterance of religious formulæ and Divine names, frequently in an utterly inarticulate manner, which one sees in certain penitential and devotional uses of the Roman Catholics, and even sometimes in the rendering of services in our own churches. The dervishes regarded the repetition of their creed and of the names and attributes of God as sanctifying the place and company, on the same theory on which among us mumbled and unintelligible prayers and holy verses are supposed to do the same thing. There is magic in them.

But the most interesting and instructive part of the service was still before us. The old sheikh now took his seat at the founder's place in front of the niche, and the healing of the sick began. First some clothing and a bottle of water for a sick person were brought to him, into which, after a brief prayer, he breathed, his breath being sanctified by the frequent repetition of the name of God. Then were brought a number of sick people who were made to lie down, a few at a time, on their faces on the wooden floor, and he walked slowly backward and forward upon their bodies. Some of them were old and feeble, and some small children, but I could not see that any suffered the least pain from the operation. Indeed the children of the neighborhood regard it as great fun, and are always on hand to be walked over as many times as the ministers will permit it. Occasionally the sheikh sought to effect a cure by merely breathing upon the patient, and not a few were passed along the line of dervishes, still grunting and bobbing up and down, to be

breathed upon by all. Indeed, mere presence in that atmosphere, saturated, so to speak, with the name of God, was supposed to be a tonic, physical as well as religious. It was an unusually successful and enthusiastic meeting, and a correspondingly large number of patients, some of them persons of position, presented themselves to be cured. Some of these cases were pathetic, inasmuch as the patients were evidently grasping at this as a drowning man grasps at a straw, as a last desperate, almost hopeless chance.

It is hardly necessary to call attention to the instructive similarity of the doctrine and practice of the Howling Dervishes to the miracles of Lourdes and Knock, or to the faith and mind cures of our own benighted land. There is also precisely the same testimony to be had regarding the efficacy of this spiritual treatment of bodily ailments which can be obtained in connection with any of our own faith cures, and no sober-minded person will deny, I presume, that in certain cases both faith doctors and Howling Dervishes may and do effect cures. I suppose, however, that the particular treatment adopted by the Howling Dervishes is better adapted to the needs of the Mussulman population of Constantinople than that of our own faith doctors would be, and *vice versa*.

CONSTANTINOPLE, August 24th, 1889.

THE FAILURE.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

AGAIN let us be brave enough to face the fact that the Church in the United States has no hold, and is gaining none, on the city populations. "Summer congregations" tell the whole story, and tell it plainly. In the summer months, churches entirely closed, or opened to congregations of fifty or a hundred, where there is room for many hundreds, prove that they are used by the few who "go out of town in summer," not by the *people* who enjoy no such advantage. Go to "the residence district" of any large city and thence to the poorer districts, and compare the noble church buildings of the former with the absolute destitution of churches in the other; and the constituency of the churches appears in another way.

For some cause our so-called parochial system, which is really a congregational system, does not reach the masses of the people. That is the deplorable fact; and it behooves the Church to meet the duty it

implies. If the parochial system cannot reach the masses, it is the part and duty of the Church to discover and provide something else that will ; and who is to discover it, if not the great council which has made itself the board of missions of the whole Church ? Would it not be better to devote a few hours or days to the retrieval of the Church's most lamentable failure in this country than to put together the most classical collection of hymns that was ever prepared for the delectation of fastidious worshippers ?

In view of all these facts we again urge and beseech those whose high office and privilege it is to participate in the responsibilities of the General Convention not to let matters of mint, anise and cummin exclude the weightier matter of consulting for the spread of the Gospel, but to make this in spirit and in truth a Missionary Convention. "The field is the world." We trust that no part of that field may be neglected ; that the foreign work may be thought of in all its parts ; that what have too exclusively been called "domestic missions" may all have their accustomed care ; that the missionary fields which exist in every diocese may be recognized as domestic missions which as closely concern the whole Church as any other missions ; that the vast problem of work among the colored people may at last have the generous treatment it has never yet had ; and, whatever else is forgotten or neglected, that the work of the Church in cities, which ought to be her greatest glory, but which now stands as her most lamentable failure, may be bravely and resolutely taken up.

FATHER HYACINTHE.

WHY HIS WORK HAS PROVED A FAILURE.

BY REV. A. DECOPPET.

From *The New York Observer*.

TWENTY years have elapsed since Father Hyacinthe, of the Order of Dominicans, raised his voice in eloquent and indignant appeal against the despotism of the Roman Catholic Church, of which until then he had been a staunch and worthy follower. Everybody will remember how readily that noble protest found an echo in the heart of the entire Christian world ; what expectations it awakened in the breasts of all those

whose abiding faith is the advancement of God's reign on earth ; and with what tokens of deep sympathy Protestants of all denominations heralded the Reform which this illustrious friar strove to work out by openly withdrawing from his order and his Church.

How stands this Reform at the present hour in France ? Has Father Hyacinthe met the expectations of the Christian world ? Has he realized the bright hopes that he then held forth ? To put these questions is as good as answering them. Father Hyacinthe's venture has not succeeded ; it has merely led to the establishment of a puny Church, without a future before it, and the very existence of which is precarious. Now when, at the end of twenty years, a reform of that kind has not obtained a larger number of followers, or signalized itself by greater conquests, one may fairly look upon the enterprise as a failure. Let any one go to the chapel in the Rue d'Assas where Father Hyacinthe occasionally preaches ; he will return with the painful impression that the work of the eloquent divine, far from being in progress, is declining every day. The movement of sympathy that welcomed his advent has abated ; even curiosity, which in the first instance brought a goodly number of listeners to hear his eloquent voice, now that it is satisfied, no longer exists. A large proportion of the congregation is made up of foreigners on their way through Paris, who are unwilling to leave the capital without seeing and hearing a man who is one of the celebrities of the day. Without claiming to be a prophet, I think one may safely predict that the new Gallican Church will not survive its founder.

What, then, can be the cause of this afflicting failure ? From a human standpoint, Father Hyacinthe had everything on his side to insure success. In the first place, remember how favorable were the times when he commenced his work. The new dogma of the Immaculate Conception had been propounded in 1854, and the famous Syllabus in 1864. Those acts inaugurated a form of Catholicism which, being intemperate and retrograde, was utterly irreconcilable with the march of modern thought and the requirements of modern society. A general feeling of discontent prevailed. Many a soul had been deeply wounded or cast down. Even among the members of the clergy a large number lamented in silence, or had to draw deeply on their fund of attachment to the Holy Church not to protest against the spiritual despotism of the Papacy. The ground, in

fact, seemed admirably prepared for a new reformation.

To all this should be further added the fact that Father Hyacinthe was already a well-known man. He had acquired a widespread and deserved reputation as a preacher at Notre Dame. He possessed, and still possesses, admirable talent and genuine power as an orator. His eloquence is warm, highly-colored and poetical, full of movements and images that recall the prophets of Israel.

To undeniable talents Father Hyacinthe added serious piety, an amiable character, and something gentle, affectionate, and modest which proceeded from his whole person. He was, in fact, a noble figure, for he was in every way a man, a conscience, and a character, which at any time command deference and attract sympathy.

With so many elements deserving of respect in his favor, how comes it, I ask, that the Reform set on foot by Father Hyacinthe should have miscarried? The main cause will be found in the fact that it was too exclusively ecclesiastical. The attention of the reformer was too entirely absorbed by the Church question. He constantly reverted to it in his addresses, which took the shape of lectures rather than of edifying sermons. Catholicism, Protestantism, Gallicanism—and ever so many more isms—were and still are his ever-recurring themes. Where is the true Church? was the fundamental question to which he everlastingly returned. Now, this question, however important, is not of those that quicken the hearts of the people. The people, in fact, care nothing about it. Father Hyacinthe, however, made sure that he was going to stir up the masses with his idea. This was a mistake. The masses are stirred only with what awakens conscience in its inmost depths. Had Father Hyacinthe turned to account those admirable powers of speech which are his, and preached on the loftier subjects of repentance, conversion, free salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, and kindred topics, he would have responded to that durable and deep-seated want which is to be found in every human breast, and brought about a religious revival in the midst of the French people. Hence would have sprung into life the Church he sought to found. The root idea would have given birth to the outer form. From the centre he would have reached the circumference. Instead of that, he started from the outside surface—on a question merely secondary after all—and has never been able to get to the core. People listened while he expatiated in eloquent terms on

vague generalities in ism; he was admired, nay, often applauded; but, after hearing him, no one ever raised a voice to ask, "What must I do to be saved?"

The reformers of the sixteenth century acted in quite a different way. With them the Church question came up only after the question of salvation; the outer garb was subordinate to the inner life; they cast into the hearts of the people that great but now forgotten aphorism: "The just shall live by faith!" And that is how they brought the people out of darkness to the light, from death to life, and why their work endures to this day. The Church question troubled them so little, that they did not even think of quitting the Church in which they had been born. It was, in fact, their own Church that drove them out from its midst, that excommunicated them. You cannot make yourself master of a man by catching hold of him by the coat-button; you must grasp him firmly round the body. Father Hyacinthe did not know how to reach souls by enlisting their concern about the great need of salvation and life which exists, more or less consciously, at the bottom of every man's heart. This was the first reason of his failure.

The second reason is the equivocal position in which he delighted to remain by claiming on all occasions the title of Catholic, when he had severed all connection between himself and official Catholicism. In a purely logical and theological sense, he had of course a perfect right to do so. Every sincere Christian is a Catholic in the sense that he belongs to the Universal Church. But a purely logical point of view is not the one that strikes and convinces the crowd. Father Hyacinthe was no longer a Catholic in the popular, historical, and ordinary sense of the term, from the day he no longer accepted all the dogmas ordered by the indisputable and infallible authority of the Pope. If anything, he was a Protestant; he repudiated, however, with energy, that glorious name. Hence a position which was more or less false and which contributed not a little to his failure. The people like clear, plain ideas, and well-defined situations. Theological subtleties have no hold upon them. Words also have their significance. To cling to a title which, when personally used, must be twisted from its popular meaning and bolstered by a whole host of theological commentaries, is willingly to court misconception.

Again, Father Hyacinthe's attitude towards the Protestants, an attitude that finally alienated them completely from him,

helped to render his efforts sterile. In the attempt at reform which he had undertaken, he failed to see that the Protestants were his natural allies, that his best interest was to spare them, or at least not to wound them; to treat them as brothers and do all he could to bind closer together the common bond of fellowship, not seek to estrange them from him.

Instead of that, he lost no opportunity in declaring that he was none of them, nor belonged to any of their denominations: that they were as evidently beyond the pale of the true Church as the Ultramontanians. On more than one occasion he railed at them in words which stung them to the quick, as when he said that Protestantism was nothing else than Cainism, and wounded them the deeper that the Protestants from the outset had been his only friends. They had given him ample proof of this friendly spirit, upholding and encouraging him in his struggle against Rome, assisting him not only with their sympathy, but by their presence at his lectures and by their contributions. The Protestants naturally cooled in their admiration of him. Their attitude to-day is one of reserve; they no longer throw open the doors of their temples to him as at the outset; they invite him no longer to speak at their meetings as they formerly did; no longer do they show the same eagerness in going to listen to his preaching.

Can anybody fairly reproach them for their coolness? And when they accuse Father Hyacinthe of ingratitude in failing to show some of that spirit of fraternal regard to which they consider themselves entitled, who shall affirm they are entirely in the wrong?

Abandoned in a measure by his natural allies, placed in an ambiguous and untenable position midway between Catholicism and Protestantism, while he still belongs to both—to the first by the groundwork of his dogmatics and to the second by his method; preaching about his Church rather than about Jesus Christ, Father Hyacinthe has fairly condemned himself to impotency. His Church is without hope in the future, and may be said scarcely to have an existence in the present. It is merely the courageous protest of a Christian conscience. It cannot be looked upon as the germ of a work fruitful in revival and reform. He is not the only one to deplore this.

All true friends of the gospel regret that such rare gifts should have produced such meagre results, and that the harvesting should have accorded so ill with the joyful hopes first awakened in every Christian breast by so noble and valiant a sower.

PREACHING TO THE PHYSICAL MAN.

BY JAMES BUCKHAM.

From *Zion's Herald*, Boston.

HUGH PRICE HUGHES, the eminent English Methodist, says, in one of his sermons: "I have no disembodied souls in my congregation." This trenchant remark was uttered by way of criticism of that sort of preaching which addresses itself solely to the spiritual man, leaving out of account the body with its peculiar needs, its appetites, its evil habits, its inherited tendencies, its faults, failings and weaknesses of every sort. The remark is full of force; the subject is timely. Never, perhaps, was there a time when the tendency among preachers was so strong and so general as at present, to address themselves to the spiritual part of their congregations—to the hypothetic disembodied soul which Dr. Hughes speaks of.

This tendency is the product of several factors, which we must content ourselves with merely mentioning. One of them is the prevalence of a higher culture among both ministers and congregations. This seems to prompt to a more lofty range of thought and discussion than was customary a generation ago. Another factor is the growing spirituality among the young people in our churches. Still another is the popular demand for what is known as "fine" or elegant preaching. All these things are direct inducements to the pastor to select spiritual themes for his discourses. It has come to seem almost coarse or undignified for a minister to "preach down" to the carnal element in his congregation. Plain, practical talk about the human body—why, that is the province of the doctors, the modern minister seems to be saying by his silence on such topics.

And yet no fact can be more evident than that the body and soul are so knit together as to be practically one. The body is, in a sense, the glove of the soul. There is a likeness, a conformity between them which this illustration exactly expresses. When we come, in heaven, to discern with the spiritual eye alone, we shall recognize the immaterial hand from its conformity to the material glove. Christ emphasized this close and intimate connection of the body and the soul. Christianity exalts the body as no other religion does—makes it the very temple of the indwelling Divine Spirit.

To neglect, therefore, so important a component part of *man*, must be indeed a grave and serious fault on the part of the preach-

ers. It implies a total disregard of some very vital facts. Man is a two-fold creature. He is always to be two-fold, bi-essential. The body is to rise from the grave and co-exist with the spirit. These two portions of our being are constantly acting and re-acting upon each other, in the present life. Each of them has a distinct and very strong influence upon its counterpart. The body left to itself, its carnal appetites, passions, tendencies, is forever dragging down the soul, like a leaden weight about the neck of a swimmer. The soul aspires, but it cannot raise an unwilling body. The very first requirement of the Christian life is the regeneration of the body. Unless that be born anew, no man can be redeemed.

Let the preacher ponder these facts. They are as essential to homiletics as the rocks that rib the earth. Preach to the body. Preach it down—and up. Preach purity, preach cleanliness, preach health, preach temperance. Preach muscular Christianity, preach an unrepachable manhood. Preach simplicity of life, hardihood, endurance. Preach the conservation of vital energy. Preach Biblical hygiene. The Bible abounds in texts that themselves were preached to the body. Remember that your congregations are not composed of disembodied souls. "Angels in the Catholic mythology have nothing but heads," says Balzac. Let it not be said by some carping critic that saints in the Protestant churches have nothing but souls.

And let it be remembered that in preaching to the body the minister does not neglect the spiritual welfare of his congregations. A good, forcible sermon preached to the body will glance into the soul like a refracted beam of light.

ORTHODOXY DEAD AGAIN.

From *The Examiner*, New York.

THAT the "orthodox" churches are no longer orthodox is a comforting delusion, believed by many because they wish it to be true. That the old faiths are obsolete or obsolescent is an assertion of which some seem never to tire. The *Boston Transcript* has lately made it with fresh emphasis. Look at the doctrine of everlasting punishment, they say; those who profess to hold this doctrine cannot really believe it. They do not preach it as they once did, and if they did preach it the pews would be emptied. By their lightness of demeanor they testify to the same state of disbelief; for, if

Christians really believed that a large part of the world is going to so terrible a doom, they would be more earnest in warning men. Churches would not be closed and ministers would take no long vacations in summer, but in all seasons no effort would be spared to rescue men from their impending doom.

On the face of it, this seems a grave indictment of "orthodox" Christianity. It makes out a case sufficiently plausible to mislead one who does not look below the surface. But will the case bear examination? Take the latter objection first: the alleged inconsistency between the professed belief and the practical conduct of Christian people. Does this prove anything against the sincerity of the belief? Nothing whatever, and for this excellent reason, that such inconsistency is one of the commonest phenomena of human nature. There is not a drunkard who is not thoroughly convinced that strong drink is a curse to him, that it is dragging his body down to the grave and his soul to the pit; but he does not therefore reform. There is no man living who is not certain he must die, in a few years at most, in a few hours possibly; yet we all go on working and planning as if we had a century before us. Men do not logically deduce their conduct from their beliefs, especially when selfishness exerts a powerful influence in an opposite direction. Life is full of this inconsistency between men's actual performance and the principles by which they acknowledge that they ought to be guided.

Another consideration must not be forgotten. There is a limit to the capacity of the human mind to feel acute emotion. Neither ecstatic joys nor soul-rending sorrows can long endure; though they may not wholly pass away, their intensity gradually subsides, and ordinary feelings resume their sway. At times the Christian's soul may be full of anguish as he contemplates the condition of the world and the doom of the unsaved; but if he had the will he has not the power to maintain his emotions thus at fever heat. Nor would his spiritual life be wholesome or beneficent, if he should succeed. He would become morbid, and his zeal would defeat its own object.

There is quite as little force in the plea that the "orthodox" doctrines are not preached now as they were once. Of course they are not. But then, nothing is done as it once was. We do not think precisely as our fathers thought, and we differ still more from them in the way we express what we do think. Theological fashions change as do fashions in dress, but the changes affect

only the outward garb, not the inner substance. We cast the old truths in new moulds, we clothe them with new forms of expression, we see them from a different angle of vision, but they are the same old truths, and are as firmly held as ever. We may alter the proportions, we may vary the emphasis, in conformity to present views of the teaching of the Scriptures, but we give up nothing that is contained in that revelation of God's will and purposes.

The decadence and death of orthodox Christianity have often been predicted, but it has survived all the prophets, and has never been more firmly believed in than now.

THE POPULARITY OF HERESY.

From The Christian-Evangelist, St. Louis, Mo.

PAUL was a heretic in the opinion of the Jews, and so were all Christians. Everything new is heresy until it gains the ascendancy, and then the old becomes heretical. Heresy, like orthodoxy, is neither a fixed quantity nor a measurable quality; it means different things in different places, and every man in the world is a heretic in the estimation of somebody else. In Roman Catholic countries dissent from the Roman Catholic church is heresy—Roman Catholicism is orthodoxy; everything else is heresy and sectarianism. In England dissent from the established church is heresy, and the Roman Catholic church herself is heretical and sectarian. In Denmark and Sweden dissent from the Lutheran church is heresy, and the Roman Catholic and English churches are alike heretical. In England, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Independency have in turn been alike orthodox and heretical. In this country, where the people are happily free from the curse of an established church, heresy has a different meaning. With Roman Catholics and Episcopalians it still means dissent from the doctrines and practices of their respective churches; but its current usage in Protestant communions is very different. It is no longer dissent from a particular church that constitutes heresy, but a dissent from sects in general and in particular—at least from all or any that belong to that Mutual Admiration Society known as Evangelical, who have elected each other to special privileges, and have combined to draw a line of circumference, within which is the charmed circle of orthodoxy and salvation; without which all is given over to heresy and damnation. To

make war on any or all of these sects, or on the sect principle; to deny their divine right to be what they are, or their equal claims to be "branches of the true church;" or to attempt the annihilation of their distinctions and the overthrow of their denominationalism—this is heresy. He who in the breadth of his catholicity and liberality embraces all evangelical denominations, believes in their equal claims to be churches of Christ, winks at their errors, condones their faults, and piously professes to think that one Protestant church is about as good as another, is orthodox; but he who believes only in one sect, or in none, is a heretic. This variable and somewhat uncertain meaning of the term and the fact that every man in the world is a heretic in the estimation of somebody else have rendered the term quite harmless in these our modern days. What a tremendous change has come over the world in respect to the odium of the charge of heresy! To be suspected of the slightest departure from the orthodox theology of the time, or of the least sympathy with opinions that did not bear the stamp of the popular ecclesiastical mint, was but a short time ago the most damaging crime of which a man could be accused.

Two centuries ago the charge of heresy was worse than the brand of Cain. The heretic was looked upon with unconcealed horror, and treated with less consideration than a monster of the sea or a wild beast of the forest. The basest and most degraded criminal, enveloped in dungeon horrors and awaiting the gallows or "electrocution," is treated with more humanity and kindness now than the noblest and purest man who merely differed in opinion on some trivial doctrinal question with the church magnates of his age and country, was treated in Germany, France, Switzerland, Spain, and even in England, long after the commencement of the Lutheran Reformation. To be convicted of heresy meant the confiscation of property for the benefit of the church coffers, the loss of the common rights of citizenship, the loss of reputation, and generally imprisonment, torture, and death. Bullets, racks, fagots, and thumb-screws were considered the most effective arguments wherewith to convince the heretic of his mistakes in daring to believe anything the church didn't believe. A breath of suspicion against a man's orthodoxy was a sufficient pretext on which to slit his nose, cut off his ears, tear out his tongue by the roots, burn his flesh, splinter his bones, or pillory him in a public thoroughfare till he recanted or confessed his heresy. And long after this red-handed

violence and physical torture ceased to be an orthodox method of punishing heresy there was a moral persecution in the withdrawal of patronage in business, the loss of reputation, social ostracism, and the consciousness of being regarded with bitterness and horror, that made the heretic, so called, scarcely less uncomfortable than in the olden time of the inquisition and its accompanying terrors. Many in those times who felt a contempt in their hearts for the abuses and bigotries that exercised themselves in the name of religion, dared not to speak out for fear of the consequences. They knew that they would be hated, persecuted, and have their names cast out as evil. And hence, like Erasmus, the German philosopher of the Reformation, they sat on the fence, or to maintain an equilibrium of safety they spoke an equal number of words on both sides.

But how wonderfully different are things to-day! There are no disabilities for heresy in these enlightened times, either civil, social, religious, political or reputational. On the contrary, it is the quickest route to greatness. It is the short cut to renown and popularity. The modern heretic has all the glories of martyrdom without its sufferings. Modern culture is lionizing heresy, especially in religion. If a minister in these days is dull, stupid and unattractive, and cannot induce people to come and listen to his weekly installment of platitudes, let him give forth some of the "ideahs" of modern "culchah," announce himself an advanced "thinkah," give vent to a few heretical opinions which will bring him into rebellion against the constituted authorities of his church, and his reputation is made. The depleted exchequer will suddenly swell, the empty pews will fill up, the aisles and vacant seats will be called into requisition to accommodate the increasing multitudes who flock to hear the hero of heresy. If he speaks at a public meeting his rising is a signal for a perfect ovation of applause, such as only a prince or a warrior chieftain might expect. The newspapers are all in his favor; they eulogize him as a persecuted man who is fighting for liberty, and exhaust the dictionary supply of bitter expletives to characterize his opponents, who are narrow, bigoted, hypocritical, and everything bad. The best known names in the annals of current history are those who have been arraigned for heresy, such as David Swing of Chicago and Professor Robertson Smith of Scotland. It at once raises a man to national importance and gives him a national reputation.

If a man can only get up a good heresy case now-a-days his fortune is made. He

need not be brilliant, or profound, or scholarly, or eloquent, or specially attractive, but only eccentric and heretical. A man now has only to declare himself an evolutionist, contradict the Mosaic account of the creation and the Fall, deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, affirm that the inspiration of Isaiah and Paul was the same in kind and only different in degree to that of Shakespeare and Tennyson, affirm that the incarnation and the resurrection are not historic realities, but rhetorical draperies to illustrate the idea of the indwelling of God in man, and the rising of man into a new life—let him do all these or any one of them, and men will throw their hats into the air and shout themselves hoarse in his glorification. The newspapers at any rate will espouse his cause and advertise him gratuitously all over the world. Who would not live in the nineteenth century and be a heretic?

EVERY-DAY CHURCH WORK.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston.

WE have watched with unqualified approval the growing interest in the practical phases of church work in this country. In all of our great cities there is springing up a feeling of dissatisfaction as to the results of present methods of work, and a desire to find something better. One of the signs of this new feeling is the sympathetic interest with which Christians of all denominations are watching the new church enterprises which are employing special methods in their attempts to reach the unchurched masses.

During the past five years quite a number of these enterprises have been started, as, for example, St. George's Church in New York, Bethany Church, Philadelphia, Berkeley Temple, Boston, Hope Church, Springfield, and Pilgrim Church, Worcester. No two of these churches are doing their work in the same way, but it is interesting to notice that most of them make much of the principle that the gospel is concerned with body, soul and spirit, with Sunday and all the rest of the week. There is not half the danger of secularizing the church that there is of failing to spiritualize secular things. The church of the past has stood too much isolated from the daily affairs of men. It has too often been nothing but a pulpit platform, open once or twice a Sunday for the edification of a few respectable church-goers.

With the church doors closed most of the week, and the church organization practi-

cally inoperative save as an ecclesiastical body, there is very little to attract the attention of those who are indifferent to religious matters. They see the imposing structure, and see in the newspapers the reports of the eloquent sermons which are preached there on Sunday. They know about the church quarrels and the shortcomings of the ministers, and the sum total of their impression of the word church is a fine edifice, plus a fine sermon, with, now and then, a fine scandal; an impression due, on the one hand, to the inactivity of the friends of the church, and, on the other hand, to the activity of its critics. What possible reason can be given why a Young Men's Christian Association should keep open doors all the week, and be engaged in all kinds of secular work, in order to reach and save young men, while the church, which claims to be the body and to enshrine the beating heart of the Christ of the world, is sitting in practical idleness six days out of the seven? It is not enough to say, by way of excuse for this idleness, that the church is working through the individual Christians out in the world. That is a sophism which has in it the ultimate extinction of the church as an organization, and is contrary to the design of its Founder. Every Christian has a two-fold duty. He stands before the world as a Christian, and, at the same time, as a member of an organized institution. He is a man, but he is also a soldier. He must act in and for and with an army. His duty as a man does not nullify or supersede his duty as a soldier. His obligations as an individual Christian are not identical with his obligations as a church-member. In the latter relation he is under a corporate obligation. He is bound to see that the church, as a church, makes its legitimate impression upon the world as the source and centre of all philanthropic and beneficent ministration. Otherwise, why need he belong to a church? Why need there be any church? The logical outcome of our present policy of relegating to individuals that "daily ministration" which was the duty of the early church as a corporate body is the final extinction of the church itself.

THE LOG-CABIN COLLEGE OF THE OLD NORTH STATE.

BY SARAH GOULD.

From *The Christian Intelligencer*, New York.

It was opened in Guilford County, North Carolina, 1765, by the Rev. Dr. David Cald-

well, a Presbyterian missionary. He was a man of iron constitution, strong practical sense and striking originality. His peculiar talent—sustained by weight of character and kindness—for drawing out the best intellectual faculties, secured from his pupils lasting respect and love. Youth from all the Southern States assembled for his instruction in The Log Cabin. This was a structure two stories high, with a chimney through the centre. Fifty ministers were under his training. Many of his scholars rose to distinction as statesmen, lawyers and judges. Five were governors of different States. Theology, the classics and the sciences were all taught by himself. His mode of discipline was beyond imitation. It is said that no one was ever expelled from his school. The rod was almost unknown. For offences, his looks, with a few words, sufficed. His manner sometimes left the transgressor in doubt whether something further was not in reserve!

"His Log Cabin," writes the Rev. E. B. Currie, "served for many years as an Academy, a College and a Theological Seminary. His manner of governing the school, the family and the churches, was much the same—on the mild plan, attended with wit and humor. Few men have ever succeeded in keeping better order."

Dr. Caldwell's wife was a lady of amiability, education and superior intelligence. She was an eminent Christian, and had a powerful influence on the College. She was continually resorted to by students anxious for their soul's salvation. Many became preachers who had not thought of it before entering the College. Seven were licensed at one time. It became a by-word that "Dr. Caldwell made the scholars, but Mrs. Caldwell made the preachers." She was the daughter of the Rev. Alexander Craighead, of Mecklenburg County, and a native of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania—the same place as her husband.

"He had a large school," continues Mr. Currie, "which he generally attended five days in the week, two large churches which he catechised twice a year, four communions which lasted four days each, besides visiting the sick, preaching to vacant churches and studying."

His recreation was labor. With his own hands he ditched and irrigated his meadows, devoting an hour or two morning and evening; and if not thus occupied, was always busy at other work. No physician lived near him; and the settlement being new, the people were unprovided with medicines. He studied with a Philadelphia physician,

who spent a year at his house, where he died. After the physician's death, Dr. Caldwell purchased his books at a low price, and became the only practitioner in a region twenty miles around.

The first minister of the Church of England had come to North Carolina in 1704. From that time till 1776 people of every religious profession were taxed for "the erection of churches, purchase of glebes, and support of church ministers." A law passed at Wilmington, N. C., January 30th, 1764, compelling all qualified persons, "under a penalty of twenty shillings," to subscribe to the following: "I will not oppose the doctrine, discipline and liturgy of the Church of England as by law established." His persistent efforts in the cause of Presbyterianism—it cannot be questioned—did much to promote religious freedom in the South.

Dr. Caldwell was born in 1765, and apprenticed to a carpenter until twenty-one years of age. After working at the trade four years more, he became anxious to preach. By teaching and studying alternately, he managed to get a college education. His own hard experience and ability in communicating, induced him to share the burdens of others; and he benefited multitudes gratuitously. His terms of tuition never exceeded ten or twelve dollars per annum.

He lived ninety-nine years, and his last days were enlivened by visits and letters from men prominent in the world—some with heads as white as his own—who gratefully acknowledged his devoted care, asserting that their highest aspirations and their success in life were owing to his teachings in the College of The Log Cabin.

THE GERMAN REFORMED AND THE CONGREGATIONALISTS.

BY REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

THE German Reformed Church grew out of the fact that the Protestant Christians of Switzerland and Germany could not accept all the teachings of either Zwingli or Luther, and preferred the type of doctrine taught by Melancthon, and afterwards systematized by Calvin. Melancthon was the reformer of the Palatinate, the rich and beautiful country on the upper Rhine, of which Heidelberg on the Neckar was the capital. The elector, Frederick III., surnamed the Pious, one of the seven princes who, in the name of the people, elected the emperor of Ger-

many, was the first ruler professing the non-Lutheran form of the Protestant faith. He invited two young theologians, exiled for their faith, to chairs of theology in the Heidelberg University, and requested them to prepare a catechism and symbol of faith. The result of the labors of these young men, Ursinus and Olevianus, aged respectively twenty-six and twenty-eight, was the Heidelberg Catechism. This one symbol and standard of the German Reformed Church seems like a work of inspiration. It is the simplest, grandest, most catholic and most Scriptural of all the Reformation confessions. It deals less with logic than with experience, and is saturated, not so much with metaphysics, as with Scripture. It soon became the standard of the Reformed churches in Germany, Holland and Hungary. By voyagers, explorers, the dominie, and the schoolmaster, it was borne by the Dutch into all continents. It was the first Protestant catechism taught in America. First published in 1563, it has been translated into all the languages of Europe, and into many Asiatic and African tongues, including Hebrew and Arabic. Four English translations from the Latin were made as early as 1591, and studied in Scotland and England, as well as by the British refugees in Holland. After the Bible, *The Imitation of Christ*, and *The Pilgrim's Progress*, no other book has been so widely known and translated as the Heidelberg Catechism. Its teachings are grouped around the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the twelve articles of the Christian faith commonly called "The Apostles' Creed." While the Dutch, in the name of "scientific" theology, have added five other monuments of confessional symbolism, including the canons of the Synod of Dort (which the Pilgrims and their leader so stoutly defended), and while the British have elaborated the Westminster theology (with more proof-texts from the Old than from the New Testament), the German Reformed Christians hold to this one standard of simple, vital, experimental, catholic Christianity.

There are Reformed churches in every country in Europe, and in the European part of Asia, Africa, and Oceanica, comprising nearly forty distinct bodies, in which many languages are used, numbering, in 1885, 10,405,025 adherents, 7,031,310 communicants, 6,233 congregations, and 5,726 ministers. An expert, Rev. J. H. Dubbs, D.D., of Lancaster, Pa., considers these figures (which are exclusive of the 18,310,929 adherents and 9,364,968 communicants of Presbyterian churches) to be much below

the mark. Outside of Europe, the Reformed people have been scattered by colonization, by commerce and enterprise, but only occasionally by persecution. How, then, came the Germans so early to the United States, and so numerous to Pennsylvania?

To tell the whole story would be to outline the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648, when Germany was the battle-ground of Europe, and Protestants and Romanists fought each other, the one for freedom, the other to restore old faiths and re-rivet broken chains. When the Protestant cause seemed lost, Gustavus Adolphus appeared with his Swedes to the rescue of liberty. The treaty of Westphalia, though lauded as a supposed confirmation of German freedom of conscience, was in reality a triumph of French diplomacy, and in one sense worse than the war. It divided Germany into fractions in order that the France of Richelieu and Louis XIII. and XIV. might be supreme. It was Louis XIV. who cut from the German fatherland a slice of Alsace, secured in their villainous power the robber barons who he knew would not only prevent the unity of Germany, but grind the people, impoverished by a generation of war and the loss of industries and commerce which, during the interval, England and Holland had attracted. He it was who so favored the Jesuits that, after a few years, Romanism had been introduced into 1,922 Protestant towns and villages. This latter process is now being repeated in Canada, the French gradually ousting the English from many places. Priests and orators still cite as precedents, to fire and encourage the squatter-conquerors, the success won in Germany during the age of Louis Quatorze. On Germany's misery, France thrived for another generation. In 1689, disappointed in his scheme to be elected emperor, Louis XIV. perfidiously, in time of peace, seized Alsace. Claiming also the Palatinate, he invaded it, burning towns and cities, devastating fields and vineyards, and turning the fairest part of Germany into a desert. Over one hundred thousand people, robbed, homeless, hungry and starving, wandered in field and forest, until the land stank with unburied corpses. No one can fully understand the eagerness and calm unity with which the Germans arose in 1871 to wreak the nursed vengeance of nearly two centuries on their old oppressors, for the awful cruelties of the French invasions of 1689 and later years.

Tens of thousands of German refugees were fed and sheltered in Holland, and sent to the Dutch colonies. Others reached

England, and soon began therefrom the first of the many emigrations to Pennsylvania. The war and desolation continuing, another horde of 30,000 peasants fled from home. Soon, near cities in Holland and England were encampments of "Palatines," living in the open air and in misery. Escaping massacre at the hands of British roughs and Protestant fanatics, the Roman Catholics were sent back to Germany. Other thousands were distributed in Ireland, and on English noblemen's estates to earn a livelihood. The remainder, well robbed in transit, reached the British colonies, most of which were within the limits of the present United States. Here, afflictions, compared to which those suffered by the Pilgrim fathers were mild experiences, met the refugees. In Mississippi they died of yellow fever, and in North Carolina they were massacred by the Tuscarora Indians. In Pennsylvania alone they found peace, health, prosperity, political and religious freedom. The news of their happy condition reaching Europe attracted thousands of Swiss and Germans, some very poor, some in comfortable circumstances, but all frugal and industrious. Outflowing from "the Christian Commonwealth" of Pennsylvania, they settled also in the Mohawk Valley and other points in New York, and downward into the Shenandoah and other valleys of Virginia, and in the Carolinas. The general name given to all these people was "Palatines." Many of the battle-fields of our late Civil War were on the ground first settled by "this one race in the United States which most fully got into the soil," and have held their ancestral seats with less change of ownership than any other. In the Revolutionary War no people were more loyal to the cause of American independence. They formed one-third of the population of Pennsylvania. The German regiments usually went into battle singing hymns. Maryland also sent a German regiment, and Washington's body-guard of fifty-seven men were Germans. The European drill masters, chief of whom was Steuben (an elder in the German Reformed Church), the man for the hour at Valley Forge, and who so drilled the Continentals that they never again were worsted by equal forces, were Germans. The most stubbornly contested, and, for the numbers engaged, the bloodiest, battle of the war was fought at Oriskany, N. Y., by the Palatine Germans. The preaching and social and personal influence of the Pennsylvania Germans—led off by Washington's "baker general," Ludwick—did more to decimate by desertion, and weaken by en-

lightenment, the ranks of the Hessians—honest men, misguided and goaded to strange acts by British officers' lies about the Americans—than all the infantry bullets or artillery balls of militia and Continentals, or the accidents and sicknesses of war. Not a few thrifty farms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia are to-day owned by the descendants of "converted" Hessians. Custer, the brilliant cavalry leader and boy-general of the late war, who "never lost a gun or a color," was the great-grandson of one of those Hessian "mercenaries" who so numerously refused to be exchanged when the war was over.

Not all the Germans who have settled Pennsylvania's lovely valleys were of the Reformed Church. There were also Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites or Tunkers, Lutherans and Schwenkfelders. Most interesting to us, as Congregationalists, are these latter, who were followers of the German nobleman, Count Schwenkfeld, one of the reformers who differed from both Luther and Calvin as to the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Schwenkfelders are Congregationalist in polity, and have sloughed off the main errors of their teacher. Besides a few congregations in Europe, they have five or six churches, with a thousand or more members, in Pennsylvania. A very handsome edition of the entire writings of Schwenkfeld is to be edited by Rev. Dr. Chester D. Hartranft, now of Hartford, himself a good, but by no means an exceptional, specimen of Pennsylvania German stock. The first ecclesiastical protest (1688) against slavery, the first book (1737) published against slavery, the first paper mill (1690), the first Bible (1743) printed, the finest and largest specimen of colonial printing and book-making, the first work (1770) on the philosophy of pedagogics, in America, came from the Pennsylvania Germans. An expert typographer has estimated that one-half of all the books printed by Franklin were for the Germans.

The first German Reformed *coetus*, or synod, which was in reality an advisory body like a Congregational conference or council, was formed in 1747 by the famous Michael Slatter; and in 1793 the Church became entirely independent of the Classis of Amsterdam. Now, out of 802 ministers and 185,000 members, 538 of the former, or 67 per cent., live in Pennsylvania or Ohio. In New Jersey there are 140 ministers, in Michigan 35, and westward 35. With 16 colleges and schools, 15 English and 6 German periodicals, and 4 orphans' homes, the Reformed Church in the United States does

not lack for educational facilities. One-half of her ministers can preach in the German tongue. In the majority of the churches English is used.

Though in faith and doctrine substantially one with Congregationalists, the German Reformed Christians as a body have had little to do with New England churches, though in nearly all the large towns and the manufacturing villages individuals from the fatherland enter the Congregational churches. There is a German Reformed church in Boston, and the pastor, Rev. L. B. Schwartz, is a man of high culture. At Waldoborough, Me., from 1751 to 1851, a large colony of Lutherans and Reformers had a union church, celebrating the Lord's Supper alternately according to the two rites, until, too few in numbers to maintain organization, they entered as a body the Congregational church there. Besides the fair sprinkling of German names in our Year-Book, and the ministers crossing the bounds into the Congregational fold, there are others who, like Rev. N. H. Keyes and E. E. Higbee, New England men, have adorned Reformed pulpits. In the West, even more than in the East, there are many thousands of people born in the German Reformed Church who are one with us in faith, doctrine and polity.

HONORARY (?) DEGREES.

From *The Christian Herald*, Detroit, Mich.

IF the "Correspondence University" of Chicago effects no other object, it is causing a thorough ventilation of the honorary degree question. It has proved to be a more combustible theme than we imagined a few weeks ago. On the strength of an article in a Chicago daily which appeared to give an authentic history of this "University" from its worthy beginning to its "diploma mill" conclusion, and from circulars which have been received at this and other offices, there has seemed to be no reasonable doubt that the concern was a fraud, and should be denounced as such. It has been so denounced by the religious press generally. Those who have won scholarly distinction by studious effort and received degrees from first-class institutions, upon which they in turn have reflected honor, have protested that there was no protection for a man unless he published the institution from which he received his degree. Such a suggestion is rather appalling. In a newspaper office many perplexities arise over the question of getting just the proper quantity and assort-

ment of alphabet to trail after a man's name, and if from one to a half-dozen educational institutions, according to the number of degrees received, must be added to the tail of each human comet—we feel unequal even to the calm contemplation of the burden which would be imposed.

There is one reflection which perhaps may not have occurred to those who covet these alphabetical distinctions: the great men of the world are known by the shortest names. Even the respectful "Mr." is dropped off. With all their undoubted right to official and scholarly titles, the world talks of Bismarck and Gladstone: prefixes and suffixes are reserved for the third-rate luminaries. Tennyson's title of "Lord" is rarely used. It is as ridiculous before his resplendent genius as a tallow candle shedding its sickly ray before an electric light. The most eminent Baptist preacher is known as Spurgeon the world over. Beecher was only Beecher. Our most eminent presidents seldom received their title. The names of Washington and Lincoln have been worn by other men, but used without adornment, they are known to refer only to the Father of his Country and the savior of the Union.

In another column appears a letter from C. Carey Willetts on "Correspondence Teaching." It is in reply to a brief editorial in the *Herald* on "Bogus Degrees," but that article contained not one word of reflection on "correspondence teaching" or studies at home. On the contrary, it was explicitly stated that the "Correspondence University" had an honorable beginning, in that eminent educators devised the scheme in order to afford instruction in the higher branches to those unable to attend college. It only condemned the institution which confers a degree upon any ignoramus who can pay the ten, twenty or fifty dollars demanded, and likewise condemned by inference the man who would be willing to sport a degree so acquired. Barnum, the great showman, once remarked: "The world likes to be humbugged and that is why humbug pays so well." It undoubtedly does pay under some circumstances, and for a time, in the world's market, but a minister of the gospel who has to buy "his title clear" from a Correspondence University, rendering only a pecuniary equivalent, in order to command respect and influence, had better get out of the ministry and into some worldly profession where such devices are winked at as mere "tricks of the trade."

The Chautauqua course is a short-cut to the acquisition of much desirable knowledge, and the teaching is by correspondence. It

does not assume to take the place of college drill, but to supplement the lack of other and better opportunities. There is no doubt that a bright, studious mind may derive more benefit from such a course than a dull youth dropped into a college hopper by parent or guardian and ground through. The Chautauqua school gives a certificate of what has been accomplished, and so very properly may any correspondence school, but when certain of these schools confer "for a consideration" the same degrees that are conferred by Yale and Harvard, and by our leading theological seminaries, we do not wonder that those who have received degrees "which mean something" should think themselves entitled to a statement of that fact.

Few of our leading colleges now confer the Master's degree "in course." A man must pursue post-graduate studies or win his spurs by some noteworthy literary work before his Alma Mater thus honors him. This is as it should be. Most German universities make doctors of divinity only of those who have published some important theological treatise. This degree has been cheapened in the United States, until the sight of it is liable to subject many of those who wear it most worthily to a fit of mental nausea.

GLADSTONE ON BIBLE STUDY.

From *The Lutheran Observer*, Philadelphia.

THE following letter from Mr. Gladstone has been addressed to the leader of a Men's Bible Class in Manchester: "It is wholly out of my power to reply to your letter in the manner which its purpose would recommend and its subject requires. But I am unwilling altogether to withhold a few words which may, at any rate, serve as an indication of sympathy with your desire to profit by the treasures of the divine Word. I will not dwell on the need of light from above, or the duty of seeking it, of being vigilant against the excuses of the private spirit, of cultivating humility, of bearing in mind that God has through all the long ages had a people whom He had led, that we are not the first who come to the wells of salvation opened by Christ and his apostles. I will assume that you are strict adherents of method in this great study, so as to make your results comprehensive. In this view, if you are churchmen, or indeed if you are not, I recommend you to consider whether the table of lessons, old or new, may not be of much use. Two things, however, espe-

cially I commend to your thoughts. The first is this—Christianity in Christ, and nearness to him and his image, is the end of all your efforts. Thus the Gospels, which continually present to us one pattern, have a kind of precedence among the books of Holy Scripture. I advise your remembering that the Scriptures have two purposes—one to feed the people of God on green pastures, the other to serve for proof of doctrine. These are not divided by a sharp line from one another, yet they are provinces on the whole distinct, and in some ways different. We are variously called to various works. But we all require to feed in the pastures and drink at the wells. For this purpose the Scriptures are incomparably simple to all those willing to be fed. The same cannot be said in regard to the proof or construction of doctrine. This is a desirable work, but not for us all. It requires to be possessed with more of external helps, more learning and good guides, more knowledge of the historical development of our religion, which development is one of the most wonderful parts of all human history, and in my opinion, affords also one of the strongest demonstrations of its truth and of the power and goodness of God."

RECENT GERMAN VIEWS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

BY REV. THOMAS S. POTWIN.

From *The Religious Herald*, Hartford, Conn.

DURING the last few months a controversy has sprung up which gives us in a nut-shell the latest phases of German opinion on the New Testament Canon.

Zahn of Leipsic is publishing a history of the New Testament Canon, and has issued the first half of the first volume with a kind of completeness by itself under the title of the *New Testament before Origen*. His position is that of the old and extreme conservatism, and he starts out with the thesis that the church has had from immemorial time "essentially the same New Testament as is printed to-day in Leipsic and Cambridge." He has not been careful to speak always respectfully of his opponents of the "scientific school."

Harnack, now of Berlin, seems to have regarded himself as challenged, and without waiting for any farther progress of the work, issued a critique of 112 pages upon this first part, in which in rather lofty style he holds up to ridicule what he considers Zahn's

self-contradictions, evasions, etc., and lays down in successive sections what is the "Fact of the Matter;" and finally winds up with the assertion that Zahn's book is "no history but a dodging of history (*Flucht vor der Geschichte*"). This brought out a rejoinder from Zahn (*Einige Bemerkungen*) of 37 pages, in which, after adjusting himself slightly to his critic, and paying his respects to his style, he re-affirms his adhesion to his former opinions.

Harnack's view comes out near the close of his criticism, as that the New Testament is "a redaction of the collective early Christian literature including the Jewish apocalypses," and he makes a kind of key to the situation out of Tertullian's remark that "Everything edifying is inspired, and all that enforces Christ is to be accepted." He believes that in the exigencies of controversy with Montanism and Gnosticism certain writings of inferior or doubtful authorship were stamped with apostolic names to give them the needed authority.

He succeeds in convicting Zahn of inconsistencies and some special pleading in support of his thesis, but he might easily be convicted himself of like special pleading in his direction.

Fortunately there is little question about actual facts. The dispute is mainly over the significance of facts in that far away time and over possible inferential facts. It results that we can take what is conceded on both sides, look over the opinions of both and form conclusions for ourselves. And the comfortable thing about all this apparent diversion and discord is that what is really vital to our New Testament does not come into discussion at all save in a very feeble protest regarding the gospel of John.

The days of a *destructive* criticism of the New Testament are apparently well past. There only remains a dispute about books which might all be withdrawn from the New Testament without essentially changing its character or value, unless the attack upon Paul by Prof. Steck of Bern is to be seriously regarded. It is the epistle to the Hebrews, the general epistles and the apocalypse about which the battle rages. As Zahn's work goes on Harnack promises to follow him if he sees occasion, so that no one will be left in doubt regarding the different views that are possible of the various parts of the problem.

These two have fairly earned the right to be considered representative men. Zahn has given some twenty-five years to historical studies in early Christian literature, and has published among other things the *Diatess-*

saron of Tatian from an Armenian translation of a Syrian text. Harnack too has devoted his life to patristic literature, and has lately published a work of somewhat revolutionary character in Dogmatic History. He claims that a true history of the Canon will be a chapter of dogmatic history.

Sympathy among Christian scholars in this country will probably lean toward Zahn, but by all means read him with Harnack's "Prüfung" at your elbow.

CHEAP MISSIONARIES.

BY MEREDITH TOWNSEND.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), July, 1889.

THE broad controversy, whether Christian missions are worth the sacrifices made for them, is still going on, but is in its very nature sterile. The parties to it are too far apart to have any common ground on which to base an argument. No one who believes Christianity to be true can doubt that its diffusion is a duty, and no one who disbelieves it can regard its propagation as anything but an officious if not mischievous interference with the natural evolution of opinion about the unseen. There is no reconciliation possible between such a faith and such a denial on such a subject, and debate upon it becomes after a while not a little tedious. There is, however, a subordinate controversy about missions of grave importance, which rages among Christians themselves, which may at any moment affect the existence of the great Missionary Fund, and which already diminishes perceptibly the zeal of many Churches. When carefully examined, this controversy resolves itself into two definite main questions, which may be stated with brutal plainness thus: Are not missionaries, especially in India, made too comfortable, too like parsons *in partibus* instead of evangelists? and is not their devotion to English education, when considered as a means of spreading Christianity, a mistake from the beginning? I propose to say a few words upon each of these two questions, which, being intended to be placatory, will be doubtless dull, but which are still the words of an entirely detached but entirely friendly observer.

To begin with the facts. I have no means of discussing them over the whole field of missions, which includes regions like Polynesia and East Africa, where martyrdom is still a probable incident in any missionary's life, but in India the charge of com-

fortableness must in part be allowed. The majority of missionaries are as comfortable there as the majority of the Nonconformist clergy would be here, if they had to work hard all day for seven days in the week in a climate which worried and exhausted them. The missionary is allowed to marry, and almost invariably does marry, and he receives a salary, usually £300 a-year, which enables him to provide himself and his family with a modest house, a sufficiency of plain food, and as much domestic help as protects himself and his wife from wasting time and health in actual bodily labour. He is also able to provide some sort of conveyance, usually a most simple affair, costing about £18 a-year, without which his own journeys must be confined to a short radius or to the cold weather, and his wife could hardly obtain any fresh air at all. She cannot, in most places, take long walks unprotected, and, if her husband is a hard worker, who is to protect her? not to mention that the climate for eight months in the year almost forbids such walking to a woman the early hours of whose day must be devoted to household cares. It is impossible for a missionary to save money; it is impossible for him, unless assisted, to obtain a becoming education for his sons and daughters, who, if brought up in India, seldom turn out well; and it is most difficult for him in his old age, if the climate has impaired his powers, to retire, like other Europeans, to spend his last days at home and in peace. He may by possibility obtain a church, but if he does not he has no pension—though some missions give a small charitable allowance—he has no savings, and he must just work on in India, in a climate which to a worn-out European is torture, till he dies, leaving his wife and children, if they are not grown up, practically to charity. That lot will not strike many professional men as an enjoyable one, but still it is not, except as regards the children, much worse than that of the poorer clergy of all denominations. They also have little hope or none of professional advancement. They also find it hard to educate their children as they would like. They also have to live their lives scantily provided, and, owing to the difference of the climate and of prices, without the "luxury" of the "conveyance," which, however, we believe in America nearly every country minister tries to keep. It is now proposed, seriously proposed, to reduce this scale of comfort—that is, in fact, to put things in figures, to send out no missionary who will not consent to make an average of £100 a-year supply all his needs.

This proposal, too, finds favour in the Churches, and among most sincere men, for it appeals to two sets of feelings, one a noble one, and one rather ignoble, though intensely natural and human.

No one who has ever observed closely the method adopted by the Societies and Churches of raising the Missionary Fund, or who has studied the limitations placed on the distributing agencies in paying away that fund, will doubt that there exists among many most sincere and pious Christians, including clergymen, an operative jealousy, almost a dislike, of the mission cause. This jealousy springs from two causes, one obvious, one a little more recondite. The fund disposable for voluntary religious work and for charity is a strictly limited fund, which does not grow as it should in proportion to the national wealth, and which is subject to serious and sometimes almost inexplicable interruptions. Out of this fund the missionary demand cuts a huge cantle—I should myself say a fourth of the whole, but that depends on the meaning assigned to religious charity—and the loss is sometimes exceedingly annoying. It not only affects “works of mercy,” but also ministers’ salaries, which are, in too many of the Churches, most inadequate, and a constant cause of concealed bitterness and repining. This of itself makes any idea of “luxury,” or even comfort, among missionaries unpleasing to those who, to speak plainly, are maintaining them, an unpleasingness further aggravated by the position assigned to missionaries in the opinion of the congregations. The missionaries are their heroes. Owing partly to tradition, partly to the occasional recurrence of martyrdoms, and partly to the excessive ordinariness of the English clerical life, the missionaries occupy a station in the imagination of the congregations higher than that of the regular pastors at home. They are held to be loftier figures, their adventures are more exciting, and their successes are more distinctly proofs that the spirit of the Lord is with them. There are churches and religious schools where the place of the heroes of history is directly taken by missionaries, and where any one who knows nothing of “the Martyr of Erromanga,” or Bishop Hannington, is regarded either as an ignoramus or an infidel. Morally, in fact, the missionary caste is regarded as the Brahmin caste of the clergy—the best, the most tried, the most efficient. That is not pleasing to the snubbed even if they agree with the verdict, and when, therefore, the Churches are told by outside observers that missionaries in India are not martyrs at all,

but very comfortable persons, who live in spacious houses and “drive about in pony traps,” there is irritation, an unwillingness to ask for subscriptions, and a disposition to say that the annual reports create a deceiving impression.

This rather ignoble, though natural, feeling would not matter much, or would pass away on further inquiry, but that it is strengthened accidentally by a far nobler one. Protestant Christians have never, that I know of, accepted a rule of poverty as binding upon their clergy, or even as a counsel of perfection, but they have never rid themselves of the feeling that the ascetic life is better, holier, nearer the apostolic example, than the comfortable one. They hate bishops for their incomes, they think rich ministers anomalies, and they are inclined to make of poverty, especially startling poverty borne for Christ’s sake, a splendid grace, and one, too, in manifesting which hypocrisy is impossible. There is not a Church in the country where this idea is not entertained by two or three of the most pious and most sincere, and naturally they apply it first of all to missionaries, who, they contend, would, if they rose to the level of their high calling, separate themselves at once from all the pleasantnesses of life. They should, such men think, be anchorites in all but seclusion, men careless of food or raiment, and indifferent even to health, living like the people they are to convert, or, if that is, for climatic reasons, impossible, accepting the lowest standard of life compatible with physical efficiency. A thousand men of this type, it is thought, would cost only a hundred thousand a year, and must make a grand impression even upon the closely packed millions of the Indian continent.

These two classes together, the enthusiasts for an idea and the jealous, make up a considerable body of opinion, all the more influential because the answer takes hold only on the experienced, and because the best evidence procurable, that of the whole body of Indian missionaries, is rejected *ab initio* as the evidence of interested persons. I have every respect for the opinion, which I recognize as thoroughly sincere, and which, if it were only well founded, would enormously increase the total volume of missionary agency; but then it is not well founded, for three reasons. The Churches would not get their supply of missionaries at once efficient and cheap. The missionaries, if they did get them, would be no more effective than the present men, and the ideal which, in the circumstances of India, is the only

one which can be profitably realized, would be finally laid aside. I will state what I mean by the third reason at the end of this article, but the other two are in truth conclusive by themselves. The Churches will not obtain their men because the cheap missionary must be a celibate, and the good missionary will not remain celibate. A young man of the missionary kind, that is a man, be his grade what it may—some of the best missionaries have been originally gentlemen, and some have been cobblers, miners, and loom-minders—who has in him the capacity of cultivation, who can learn one or two languages well, who can argue with Brahmins and not seem to them a fool, and who can guide men whose pivot of thought is not his own, may live, while he is in reality a student or an apprentice, on a hundred a year. He will not be of much use, and will probably convert nobody, but still he will be preparing himself to become efficient; but he will not marry. By the time his apprenticeship is over he will understand the conditions of Indian life, and will recognize that to ask an educated woman to share it with him on that income would be a hideous cruelty. For herself she would be simply a household servant in the tropics, the most undrurable of earthly positions, without good air, without domestic help, without good medical attendance, and without the respect of the people among whom her husband labours. They understand real asceticism perfectly well, and reverence it as a subjugation of the flesh, and if the missionary and his wife carried out the ascetic life as Hindoos understand it, lived in a hut, half or wholly naked, sought no food but what was given them, and suffered daily some visible physical pain, they might stir up the reverence which the Hindoo pays to those who are palpably superior to human needs. But in their eyes there is no asceticism in the life of the mean white, the Eurasian writer, or the Portuguese clerk, but only a squalor unbecoming a teacher and one who professes and must profess scholarly cultivation. Even if the cheap missionary could induce a fitting wife to share such a lot, he will think of the children to come, and perceives from examples all around him what on such an income their fate must be. They will be boys and girls with the white energy who have been bred up as natives—that is, they will, unless exceptional persons, belong to the most hopeless class existing in the world. They cannot be sent home or be kept in the hill schools, or be separated in any way from the perpetual contact of an Asiatic civilization which eats out of white

children their distinctive *morale*. The missionary, if an able as well as a good man, will not run that risk, and also he will not remain unmarried. The moment his apprenticeship is complete, and the great cloud of language and habits, which at first separates him from Indians, has rolled away, he will not only wish to marry, but he will perceive that he must—that the people do not believe in celibacy unless it is to be lifelong and a matter of religious obligation, that he is distrusted and watched, and very often tempted almost beyond what he can bear. It is needless to enter into a detailed argument, or to show that a celibate life in the tropics is, for a great body of men who do not believe in celibacy, simply impossible; the opinion of the experienced ought to be sufficient, and that opinion is utterly fatal to any such scheme. The cheap missionaries will leave the service just when they become efficient, or rather their united remonstrances will compel the Societies and the Churches to remodel the new scheme, and, either by increasing allowances, or by paying house-rent, doctors' bills, and children's education, to restore the old and reasonable provision. Be it remembered, the cheap missionaries will have absolutely no special result to encourage them to persevere. A missionary is not made more efficient by being scarified every day with the squalid troubles of extreme poverty, and the notion that his low position will bring him closer to the native is the merest delusion. The white missionary is not separated from the Indian by his means, but by his colour, and the difference produced by a thousand years of differing civilizations which the word colour implies. He is a European; those to whom he preaches are Asiatics: in presence of that distinction all others are not only trivial but imperceptible. The effect of the cheap missionary on the native mind will be precisely that of the dear missionary, except that, as an unmarried man, he will be regarded with infinitely more suspicion and mistrust. Nothing, in fact, will be gained by the change, except the privilege of repeating an experiment which has been made half a dozen times, and has invariably failed.

On the second question, whether the missionaries are not in error in founding English colleges, I am on the reformers' side. Personally, every prejudice I have in the world would lead me to be against them. My Indian experience brought me mainly in contact with the tutor missionaries, and I learned to respect them as among the best and most efficient of mankind. I compre-

hend, I think, fully the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff, his belief that it was only from the intellectual classes that Christianity would slowly filter down, his confidence that increased intelligence of itself would predispose Asiatics towards a creed held by the masters of the world. I acknowledge that the tutor missionaries have been successful beyond all expectation; that they have turned out, and are turning out, a whole generation of men who, in intelligence and information, are at least the equals of the majority of English graduates. The pretentiousness of the Indian cultivated which so disgusts most Europeans in India seems to me quite natural, for the lads who display it are not at heart measuring themselves with the English cultivated but with their own uncultivated countrymen, who seem to them almost savages. Nor am I greatly concerned about the "disloyalty," which, to the consternation and amazement of the Government, is becoming a note of the Indians educated in English learning. The disloyalty is only a sign of ambition, natural enough to men who have emerged from intellectual darkness, and find all further progress stopped by the foreignness of their government. I note precisely the same symptoms among the students of Russia, and regard it as a disagreeable but inevitable symptom of a more vigorous intellectual life. Politically it does not matter one straw, for, if the English are true to themselves and their mission, they will go on reigning, and, if they are not true, they may as well be beaten by an insurrection of Baboos as by an insurrection of Sepoys. If we are to go away it matters nothing who sends us, for the Mahomedan will, in any case, revindicate his position; and, the British bayonet once withdrawn, will massacre the "educated natives" just as readily and just as easily as any other native opponents. So far as I can see, the tutor missionaries have succeeded in their enterprise of making scholars by the thousand, but then those scholars neither are nor will become Christians. The effect of English education in India, whether communicated through the Government colleges or the missionary colleges, is, like the effect of that torrent of sudden enlightenment which we call the Renaissance, to kill out spirituality altogether. A whole generation becomes in its own mind intellectually free, it is intoxicated with the sense of freedom, and it ceases to consider anything but earthly knowledge a matter of any importance. The educated natives, so far from accepting Christianity, think it as much a fetter on the free movement of the intellect as Hin-

dooism is, and are proud to be as much in advance of their tutors as they are of their countrymen. Christian ideas and Hindoo ideas are both to them ideas of the populace, and they have left them miles behind. We see the same attitude of mind in Europe in our own colleges, and still more in those of the Continent, but with this considerable difference: men are governed as to their ethics in part by their creed, and in part by the social system amidst which they have been bred, and which, if the creed disappears, still exerts upon their minds an irresistible atmospheric pressure. In Europe this atmosphere is Christian, in India it is Hindoo. The educated native who disbelieves remains an Asiatic—that is, a man whose views of his duty to other men, of sexual morality, of true nobility of character, are essentially and permanently different from those of Europeans. This difference would exist in any case, but it is aggravated in India by two special conditions of life. The student leaves college at sixteen a married man, probably with one child born, united for life to a wife who influences him nearly as much, or quite as much, as a European wife influences her husband, but who has none of her husband's knowledge, none of his emancipation, and a strong suspicion and dislike of Christianity, which, as she sees clearly, would upset her social system altogether. Moreover, the educated native is under very singular bonds, and enjoys very singular liberties. If he openly quits Hindooism he is usually a ruined man, placed outside caste, shunned by his kinsfolk and his countrymen, as much a leper as an Irishman who has taken a farm from which the last tenant was evicted. His very wife will quit him, and his mother know him no more. It takes unusual social courage for a Hindoo to quit Hindooism, and at the same time there is no necessity for quitting it. Hindooism is a ceremonial creed, and if he will perform a few ceremonies, and abstain from a few articles of diet, the educated native can remain a Hindoo, and believe or disbelieve anything he pleases. He is in the position of the educated Frenchman, who, if he goes to confession once in five years and marries his daughter in church, is reckoned a Catholic, though his opinions all the while are those of Voltaire or even of d'Holbach. It was the belief of Dr. Duff that English literature, penetrated as it is with belief in the Christian code of morals and the Christian altruism, would of itself develop in the alumni of the colleges a new morality and a deeper sympathy with the suffering, but

those results have not followed. Nobody in India believes educated Indians to be better than the old Indians of the same temperaments, and of the absence of altruism there is proof in the slight agitations raised for the reform of the more oppressive native customs. The educated natives are most zealous that all appointments should be thrown open to them, but not zealous that widows should be set free from their degraded position; most eager that the revenue should be distributed as they desire, not eager that the mass of the poor should be asked to contribute less. As for a general adoption of Christianity as the national faith, such as has flashed across the leading minds in Japan—leading minds which have not been trained in colleges—it never enters their heads. The system of tutor missionaries, in fact, has neither made Christians, though of course a few among the thousands taught have embraced Christianity, nor has it given to the class affected any general bias towards that faith. The students emerge from the colleges knowing all about Christianity, just as our own lads know all about the ancient Paganism, but with no more inclination to be Christians than the pupils of the French Lycées, who also are very well taught. As a mode of teaching certain branches of knowledge the system has succeeded, but as a method of evangelizing India it has failed, and always must fail. It does not even improve India, for the native, educated in that way through a foreign tongue, and by the use of foreign methods of thought, loses all originality, and devotes his whole intellectual energy to what is in reality a rather feeble imitation of the race which of all others is most separated in thought from himself. The result can be best illustrated by one single fact. The Bengalee, speaking his own language, is before all things a humorist, a man often of brilliant wit, always with a keen perception of the comic and the incongruous. A Bengalee writing English often seems incapable of even perceiving the ridiculous.

But if the missionary is not to be a preaching friar or a tutor, what ought he to be? I contend that there is for the white missionary in Asia—for this is as true of China as of India—but one natural place, that of the preaching bishop, using that word in its accurate, and not in its English sense. His business is to make, to inspire, and to guide native Christian evangelists. It is from these and these only that the Apostle can come who will make converts by tribes and nations, and pending his arrival they can do the work, which it is

sought to have done through cheap missionaries, infinitely better. They have no languages to learn; they understand the thoughts as well as the utterance of their countrymen; they can rouse with their natural gift of poetic eloquence the enthusiasm for which the European sighs in vain. They are beginning to be counted in thousands, they do not cost one-fourth of the cheapest Europeans, and they have often a burning faith which puts that of ordinary Christians to shame. All they need is wise guidance, occasional stimulus, and, upon points, strict disciplinary control. That control need not last for ever, but at present it is indispensable. The native preacher, often to my mind an admirable man, and occasionally a most gifted one, has still the faults of all early converts, a tendency to hark back on old superstitions, a liability to moral weakness, especially as regards pecuniary affairs, a tendency to exaggerate morsels of Christian doctrine which might easily lead to a development of singular and dangerous heresies. Like the native judge, and the native soldier, and the native revenue officer, he needs still the help of the stronger European, who knows instinctively the problems which perplex him, and is, when the case is fairly before him, incapable of swerving. To my thinking the true white missionary is a man who is the head of a group of preaching natives, who confers with them every day, who perpetually stimulates their zeal, whose control, though not obtrusive, is always felt, who is the personal friend, the spiritual director, and the conscience of them all. I believe that such a man settling in any district of India for fifty years would do more to evangelize that district than a hundred white friars or a dozen English colleges, and I cannot see the sense of harassing him by reducing his wife into a servant and his children into the class of mean whites. There are seven hundred Protestant missionaries in India. Supply each of them with one hundred native preachers, costing, say, £1500 a year only for each group, and we have an evangelizing force of seventy thousand men, directed by able officers, fully acclimatized, with no language to acquire and no prejudices to unlearn, gifted with natural eloquence, and full of the zeal for the extension of the faith which belongs to early converts. That is the way to secure missionaries cheaply, not compelling cultivated white men to live like Portuguese clerks.*

* The reply to this article which appeared in the October number of *The Contemporary Review* will appear in our next issue.

II.

AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the October number, p. 47.)

"COME forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man" (Mark v. 8),* are the words attributed to Jesus. If I declare, as I have no hesitation in doing, that I utterly disbelieve in the existence of "unclean spirits," and, consequently, in the possibility of their "coming forth" out of a man, I suppose that Dr. Wace will tell me I am disregarding the "testimony of our Lord" (*loc. cit.*, p. 255). For if these words were really used, the most resourceful of reconcilers can hardly venture to affirm that they are compatible with a disbelief in "these things." As the learned and fair-minded, as well as orthodox, Dr. Alexander remarks, in an editorial note to the article "Demoniacs," in the "Biblical Cyclopædia" (vol. i, p. 664, note) :

... On the lowest grounds on which our Lord and his apostles can be placed, they must, at least, be regarded as *honest* men. Now, though honest speech does not require that words should be used always and only in their etymological sense, it does require that they should not be used so as to affirm what the speaker knows to be false. While, therefore, our Lord and his apostles might use the word *δαίμονιζεσθαι*, or the phrase *δαίμονιον ἔχειν*, as a popular description of certain diseases, without giving in to the belief which lay at the source of such a mode of expression, they could not speak of demons entering into a man, or being cast out of him, without pledging themselves to the belief of an actual possession of the man by the demons (Campbell, "Prel. Diss.," vi, 1, 10). If, consequently, they did not hold this belief, they spoke not as honest men.

The story which we are considering does not rest on the authority of the second Gospel alone. The third confirms the second, especially in the matter of commanding the unclean spirit to come out of the man (Luke viii, 29); and, although the first Gospel either gives a different version of the same story, or tells another of like kind, the essential point remains: "If thou cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go!" (Matthew viii, 31, 32).

If the concurrent testimony of the three synoptics, then, is really sufficient to do away with all rational doubt as to a matter of fact of the utmost practical and speculative importance—belief or disbelief in which may affect, and has affected, men's

lives and their conduct toward other men in the most serious way—then I am bound to believe that Jesus implicitly affirmed himself to possess a "knowledge of the unseen world," which afforded full confirmation to the belief in demons and possession current among his contemporaries. If the story is true, the mediæval theory of the invisible world may be, and probably is, quite correct; and the witch-finders, from Sprenger to Hopkins and Mather, are much-maligned men.

On the other hand, humanity, noting the frightful consequences of this belief; common sense, observing the futility of the evidence on which it is based, in all cases that have been properly investigated; science, more and more seeing its way to inclose all the phenomena of so-called "possession" within the domain of pathology, so far as they are not to be relegated to that of the police—all these powerful influences concur in warning us, at our peril, against accepting the belief without the most careful scrutiny of the authority on which it rests.

I can discern no escape from this dilemma: either Jesus said what he is reported to have said, or he did not. In the former case, it is inevitable that his authority on matters connected with the "unseen world" should be roughly shaken; in the latter, the blow falls upon the authority of the synoptic gospels. If their report on a matter of such stupendous and far-reaching practical import as this is untrustworthy, how can we be sure of its trustworthiness in other cases? The favorite "earth," in which the hard-pressed reconciler takes refuge, that the Bible does not profess to teach science,* is stopped in this instance. For the question of the existence of demons and of possession by them, though it lies strictly within the province of science, is also of the deepest moral and religious significance. If physical and mental disorders are caused by demons, Gregory of Tours and his contemporaries rightly considered that relics and exorcists were more useful than doctors; the gravest questions arise as to the legal and moral responsibilities of persons inspired

* Does any one really mean to say that there is any internal or external criterion by which the reader of a biblical statement, in which scientific matter is contained, is enabled to judge whether it is to be taken *au sérieux* or not? Is the account of the Deluge, accepted as true in the New Testament, less precise and specific than that of the call of Abraham, also accepted as true therein? By what mark does the story of the feeding with manna in the wilderness, which involves some very curious scientific problems, show that it is meant merely for edification, while the story of the inscription of the law on stone by the hand of Jahveh is literally true? If the story of the Fall is not the true record of an historical occurrence, what becomes of Pauline theology? Yet the story of the Fall as directly conflicts with probability, and is as devoid of trustworthy evidence, as that of the Creation or that of the Deluge, with which it forms an harmoniously legendary series.

* Here, as always, the revised version is cited.

by demoniacal impulses; and our whole conception of the universe and of our relations to it becomes totally different from what it would be on the contrary hypothesis.

The theory of life of an average mediæval Christian was as different from that of an average nineteenth-century Englishman as that of a West-African negro is now in these respects. The modern world is slowly, but surely, shaking off these and other monstrous survivals of savage delusions, and, whatever happens, it will not return to that wallowing in the mire. Until the contrary is proved, I venture to doubt whether, at this present moment, any Protestant theologian, who has a reputation to lose, will say that he believes the Gadarene story.

The choice then lies between discrediting those who compiled the gospel biographies and disbelieving the Master, whom they, simple souls, thought to honor by preserving such traditions of the exercise of his authority over Satan's invisible world. This is the dilemma. No deep scholarship, nothing but a knowledge of the revised version (on which it is supposed all that mere scholarship can do has been done), with the application thereto of the commonest canons of common sense, is needful to enable us to make a choice between its horns. It is hardly doubtful that the story, as told in the first Gospel, is merely a version of that told in the second and third. Nevertheless, the discrepancies are serious and irreconcilable; and, on this ground alone, a suspension of judgment, at the least, is called for. But there is a great deal more to be said. From the dawn of scientific biblical criticism until the present day the evidence against the long-cherished notion that the three synoptic gospels are the works of three independent authors, each prompted by divine inspiration, has steadily accumulated, until, at the present time, there is no visible escape from the conclusion that each of the three is a compilation consisting of a groundwork common to all three—the threefold tradition; and of a superstructure, consisting, firstly, of matter common to it with one of the others, and, secondly, of matter special to each. The use of the terms “groundwork” and “superstructure” by no means implies that the latter must be of later date than the former. On the contrary, some parts of it may be, and probably are, older than some parts of the groundwork.*

The story of the Gadarenes wine belongs to the groundwork; at least, the essential part of it, in which the belief in demoniac possession is expressed, does; and therefore the compilers of the first, second, and third Gospels, whoever they were, certainly accepted that belief (which, indeed, was universal among both Jews and pagans at that time), and attributed it to Jesus.

What then, do we know about the originator, or originators, of this groundwork—of that threefold edition which all three witnesses (in Paley's phrase) agree upon—that we should allow their mere statements to outweigh the counter-arguments of humanity, of common sense, of exact science, and to imperil the respect which all would be glad to be able to render to their Master?

Absolutely nothing.* There is no proof, nothing more than a fair presumption, that any one of the Gospels existed, in the state in which we find it in the authorized version of the Bible, before the second century, or, in other words, sixty or seventy years after the events recorded. And, between that time and the date of the oldest extant manuscripts of the Gospels, there is no telling what additions and alterations and interpolations may have been made. It may be said that this is all mere speculation, but it is a good deal more. As competent scholars and honest men, our revisers have felt compelled to point out that such things have happened even since the date of the oldest known manuscripts. The oldest two copies of the second Gospel end with the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter; the remaining twelve verses are spurious, and it is noteworthy that the maker of the addition has not hesitated to introduce a speech in which Jesus promises his disciples that “in my name shall they cast out devils.”

The other passage “rejected to the margin” is still more instructive. It is that touching apologue, with its profound ethical sense, of the woman taken in adultery—which, if internal evidence were an infallible guide, might well be affirmed to be a typical example of the teachings of Jesus. Yet, say the revisers, pitilessly, “Most of the ancient authorities omit John vii, 53–viii, 11.” Now, let any reasonable man ask himself this question: If, after an approximative settlement of the canon of the New Testament, and even later than the fourth and fifth centuries, literary fabricators had the skill and the audacity to make such additions

* See, for an admirable discussion of the whole subject, Dr. Abbott's article on the Gospels in the “*Encyclopedia Britannica*”; and the remarkable monograph by Prof. Volkmar, “*Jesus Nazarene und die erste Christliche Zeit*” (1882). Whether we agree with the conclusions of these writers or not, the method of critical investigation which they adopt is unimpeachable.

* Notwithstanding the hard words shot at me from behind the hedge of anonymity by a writer in a recent number of the “*Quarterly Review*,” I repeat, without the slightest fear of refutation, that the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers.

and interpolations as these; what may they have done when no one had thought of a canon; when oral tradition, still unfixed, was regarded as more valuable than such written records as may have existed in the latter portion of the first century? Or, to take the other alternative, if those who gradually settled the canon did not know of the existence of the oldest codices which have come down to us; or if, knowing them, they rejected their authority, what is to be thought of their competency as critics of the text?

People who object to free criticism of the Christian Scriptures forget that they are what they are in virtue of very free criticism; unless the advocates of inspiration are prepared to affirm that the majority of influential ecclesiastics during several centuries were safeguarded against error. For, even granting that some books of the period were inspired, they were certainly few among many; and those who selected the canonical books, unless they themselves were also inspired, must be regarded in the light of mere critics, and, from the evidence they have left of their intellectual habits, very uncritical critics. When one thinks that such delicate questions as those involved fell into the hands of men like Papias (who believed in the famous millenarian grape story); of Irenæus with his "reasons" for the existence of only four Gospels; and of such calm and dispassionate judges as Tertullian, with his "*Credo quia impossibile*," the marvel is that the selection which constitutes our New Testament is as free as it is from obviously objectionable matter. The apocryphal Gospels certainly deserve to be apocryphal; but one may suspect that a little more critical discrimination would have enlarged the Apocrypha not inconsiderably.

At this point a very obvious objection arises and deserves full and candid consideration. It may be said that critical skepticism carried to the length suggested is historical pyrrhonism; that if we are to altogether discredit an ancient or a modern historian, because he has assumed fabulous matter to be true, it will be as well to give up paying any attention to history. It may be said, and with great justice, that Eginhard's "Life of Charlemagne" is none the less trustworthy because of the astounding revelation of credulity, of lack of judgment, and even of respect for the eighth commandment, which he has unconsciously made in the "History of the Translation of the Blessed Martyrs Marcellinus and Paul." Or, to go no further back than the last num-

ber of this review, surely that excellent lady, Miss Strickland, is not to be refused all credence because of the myth about the second James's remains, which she seems to have unconsciously invented.

Of course this is perfectly true. I am afraid there is no man alive whose witness could be accepted, if the condition precedent were proof that he had never invented and promulgated a myth. In the minds of all of us there are little places here and there, like the indistinguishable spots on a rock which give foothold to moss or stone-crop; on which, if the germ of a myth fall, it is certain to grow, without in the least degree affecting our accuracy or truthfulness elsewhere. Sir Walter Scott knew that he could not repeat a story without, as he said, "giving it a new hat and stick." Most of us differ from Sir Walter only in not knowing about this tendency of the mythopœic faculty to break out unnoticed. But it is also perfectly true that the mythopœic faculty is not equally active on all minds, nor in all regions and under all conditions of the same mind. David Hume was certainly not so liable to temptation as the Venerable Bede, or even as some recent historians who could be mentioned; and the most imaginative of debtors, if he owes five pounds, never makes an obligation to pay a hundred out of it. The rule of common sense is *prima facie* to trust a witness in all matters in which neither his self-interest, his passions, his prejudices, nor that love of the marvelous, which is inherent to a greater or less degree in all mankind, are strongly concerned; and, when they are involved, to require corroborative evidence in exact proportion to the contravention of probability by the thing testified.

Now, in the Gadarene affair, I do not think I am unreasonably skeptical if I say that the existence of demons who can be transferred from a man to a pig does thus contravene probability. Let me be perfectly candid. I admit I have no *a priori* objection to offer. There are physical things, such as *tanix* and *trichine*, which can be transferred from men to pigs, and *vice versa*, and which do undoubtedly produce most diabolical and deadly effects on both. For anything I can absolutely prove to the contrary, there may be spiritual things capable of the same transmigration, with like effects. Moreover, I am bound to add that perfectly truthful persons, for whom I have the greatest respect, believe in stories about spirits of the present day, quite as improbable as that we are considering.

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Selected by Mr. C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

THE GIFT OF GOD.

"POOR SINNER! consider the Treasure thou hast within Thee, the Saviour of the World, the eternal Word of God lies hid in Thee, as a Spark of the Divine Nature, which is to overcome Sin and Death, and Hell within Thee, and generate the Life of Heaven again in thy Soul. Turn to thy Heart, and thy Heart will find its Saviour, its God within itself. Thou seest, hearest, and feelest nothing of God, because thou seekest for Him abroad with thy outward Eyes, thou seekest for Him in Books, in Controversies, in the Church, and outward Exercises, but *there* thou wilt not find Him, till thou hast *first* found Him in thy Heart. Seek for Him in thy Heart, and thou wilt never seek in vain, for there He dwelleth, there is the Seat of his Light and Holy Spirit. For this turning to the Light and Spirit of God within Thee, is *thy only true* turning unto God; there is no other Way of finding Him, but in that Place where he dwelleth in Thee. For though God be everywhere present, yet He is only present to Thee in the deepest, and most central Part of thy Soul. Thy natural *Senses* cannot possess God, or unite Thee to Him, nay thy inward Faculties of *Understanding, Will and Memory* can only reach after God, but cannot be the *Place* of his Habitation in Thee. But there is a *Root, or Depth* in Thee, from whence all these Faculties come forth, as Lines from a *Center*, or as Branches from the Body of the Tree. This Depth is called the *Center, the Fund or Bottom* of the Soul. This Depth is the *Unity, the Eternity*, I had almost said, the *Infinity* of thy Soul, for it is so infinite, that nothing can satisfy it, or give it any Rest, but the Infinity of God. In this *Depth* of the Soul, the Holy Trinity brought forth its own living Image in the first created Man, bearing in Himself a living Representation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and this was his Dwelling in God and God in him. This was the Kingdom of God within Him, and made Paradise without Him."

THE PEARL OF ETERNITY.

"*First*, it is the *Light and Spirit* of God within Thee. . . . When Man first came into Being, this *Light and Spirit* of God was as *natural* to him, as truly the Light of his Nature, as the *Light and Air* of this World is natural to the Creatures that have their Birth in it. But when Man, not content with the Food of Eternity, did eat of the earthly Tree, this *Light and Spirit* of Heaven was no more *natural* to him, no more rose up as a Birth of his Nature, but instead thereof, he was left solely to the *Light and Spirit* of this World. And this is *that Death*, which God told *Adam*, he should surely die, in the Day that he should eat of the forbidden Tree.—The Bruiser of the Serpent brought *Light and Spirit* of Heaven *once more* into the human Nature; [but] not as it was in Paradise, but as a *Treasure hidden* in the Center of our Souls, which should discover, and open itself by Degrees, in such Proportion, as the *Faith and Desires* of our Hearts were turned to it. This *Light and Spirit* [. . . lying in the Soul is] as a *secret Source* of Heaven, [and] is called *Grace, Free Grace*, or the *Supernatural Gift*, or Power, of God in the Soul, because it was something, that the Natural Powers of the Soul could no more obtain. . . . *Secondly*, this Pearl of Eternity is the *Wisdom and Love* of God within Thee. In this Pearl of Thy Serpent Bruiser, all the Holy Nature, Spirit, Tempers, and

Inclinations of CHRIST lie as in a Seed in the Center of thy Soul; and divine Wisdom and heavenly Love will grow up in Thee, if thou givest but true Attention to God present in thy Soul. It is there as an *Holy Oil*, to soften and overcome the wrathful fiery Properties of thy Nature, and change them into the humble Meekness of Light and Love. It is there as a *speaking Word* of God in thy Soul, and as soon as thou art ready to hear, this eternal speaking Word will speak. . . . *Thirdly*, this Pearl of Eternity, is the *Church, or Temple* of God within Thee, the consecrated Place of Divine Worship, where alone, thou canst worship God in *Spirit, and in Truth*. . . . Accustom thyself to the Holy Service of this inward Temple. In the midst of it is the Fountain of Living Water, of which thou mayest drink, and live forever. There the Mysteries of thy Redemption are celebrated, or rather opened in Life and Power. There the Supper of the Lamb is kept. . . . There the Birth, the Life, the Sufferings, the Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of CHRIST, are not merely remembered, but inwardly found, and enjoyed as the real States of thy Soul, which has followed CHRIST in the Regeneration. *Fourthly, and Lastly*, This Pearl of Eternity is *Peace and Joy* of God within Thee, but can only be found by the Manifestation of the Life and Power of JESUS CHRIST in thy Soul. But CHRIST cannot be thy Power and thy Life, till in Obedience to his Call, *thou deniest thyself, takest up thy daily Cross, and followest Him*, in the Regeneration."—WILLIAM LAW, *The Spirit of PRAYER*; or the SOUL Rising out of the Vanity of Time into the Riches of ETERNITY, 8d ed., London, 1752.

MEMORY AFTER DEATH.

I've prov'd, and shew'd she* is not very God;
But yet a decent *Deiformity*
Have given her: thus in the middle trod
I safely went, and fairly well have row'd
As yet. Part of my voyage is to come,
Which is to prove that the souls never abroad
In heaven or hell (what ever is her doom)
Nought hinders but past forms even there again
may bloom.

Which if they did not, she could never tell
Why she were thus rewarded, therefore ill
Or good she doth enjoy, whether ill or well
She lived here. Remembrance death did spill.

This faculty† is very intimate
And near the Centre, very large and free,
Extends it self to whatsoever that
The soul peracts. There is no subtilty
Of Intellect, of Will, nor Phantasie;
No Sense, nor uncouth strange impression
From damned Night, or the blest Deity,
But of all these she hath retention,
And at their fresh approach their former shapes
can own.

This memorie the very bond of life
You may well deem. If it were cut away
Our being truly then you might contrive
Into a point of time. The former day
Were nought at all to us; when once we lay
Our selves to sleep, we should not know at morn
That e're we were before; nor could we say
A whit of sense: so soon as off we turn
One word, that's quite forgot. Coherence thus is
torn.

ANTIMONOPSYCHIA or the fourth part of the Song of the SOUL. By H. M. (Henry More.) Cambridge, 1647.

* The soul.

† Memory.

PARAGRAPHIC.

IN Cardinal Gibbons' recent pastoral letter he treats at some length the recent glorification of Giordano Bruno. There are many who will agree with him when he says that the throngs who attended the unveiling of the statue in the Campo dei Fiori meant "not so much to honor Bruno as to insult and vilify the Vicar of Christ," *i.e.*, the pope. So let it be. No one nowadays adheres to the philosophy of Bruno and the late popular demonstration was merely a protest against the infallible authority that burned him alive. The unchangeable papacy would likewise wish, if it were consistent, to burn Wallace and Huxley, not to speak of Herbert Spencer.

Without agreeing with these eminent men there are thousands who would vindicate them under persecution, and even erect a statue to them, not because they were Christians, but because they were sincere and conspicuously successful in searching for truth along certain intellectual lines. In their department they have served the best interests of the world.—*Churchman*.

THE POWER OF A PICTURE.—In the chapel of the Women's Prison at Sherborn there is a striking picture of Christ standing before the woman taken in adultery. The light beaming from His face, the pose of His figure, the outstretched hand, seem to utter a benediction of hope over the prostrate woman. Beneath it is written, "Go and sin no more." A few years ago, one evening when the women were dismissed after prayers, one remained in her seat. She was one of the worst to manage of all the prisoners. The matron, supposing some new trouble was brewing, went and asked what was the matter. The woman, with her eyes fixed on the picture, said, "I want to go into the solitary cell." "Why," said the matron, "what do you mean? You have just had to spend a week there." "I want," said the woman, "to go and be alone where I can think about Him that is in that picture."

She went into solitary confinement, remained a week, came out to serve the rest of her sentence with a deportment that called for no criticism, and, since leaving the prison, has lived an upright life. If the painter of that picture could get on canvas an expression of Christ of such power, cannot we get the same into our lives and faces? The ability to inspire those who have lost faith in themselves with faith in the reality of a holy life, and the hope of gaining it, is worthy to be sought as an art and coveted as the highest gift.—*The Congregationalist*.

A CRANK ON BURGLARS.—Hugh O. Pentecost, the former Congregational minister of Newark, N. J., preaches a sort of anti-poverty gospel with Dr. McGlynn and Henry George—that is to say, when he is not quarrelling with them on some visionary point. On the last Labor Day he made a speech at New York, and is reported to have said:

"If I knew a burglar was in my house at night, I would go to him unarmed, and talk to him as I would to a friend whom I desired to help. If he then desired to take my goods, I would make no protest, but would follow him to the door, and invite him to call again."

The Norristown *Herald* is equal to any emergency in the crank line, and he seconds Mr. Pentecost's transcendental philanthropy in the following style:

"That's the right sort of Christian spirit. Too often when a man hears a burglar in his house, instead of going downstairs and being friendly with the intruder, and helping to pack up the silverware

and things, he becomes panic-stricken, grabs his revolver, and discharges half a dozen shots at random, one of which wounds his wife, another goes through a mirror, and the remainder lodge in the walls, if there are no other innocent persons in the house to perforate. Such conduct is calculated to make the burglar so shy, that instead of calling again, he will honor a neighbor with the next professional visit." See Prov. xxvi. 5.—*The Lutheran Observer*.

A BIBLICAL OPINION OF MAN.—Wife: "The Bible says much in favor of women, John. I thought that the Israelites kept their women in the background, but if they did, the Bible, which is their history, doesn't."

Husband: "Humph! The Israelites did well by keeping their women in the background; that's where woman should be."

Wife: "But still the Bible says that—"

Husband: "Oh, I know there are a few women mentioned in the Bible—there was Jezebel, she was a woman."

Wife: "Yes; and there was Ahab, he was a man. And there was—"

Husband: "It is no use talking, Mary. The Bible is a history of men. Women are mentioned only incidentally as they had influence on the actions of men. The book says little about women compared to what it does about men!"

Wife (musingly): "You may be right, John, now when I come to think of it. There is one thing, at any rate, it says about men that it does not say about women."

Husband (smilingly): "I thought you would come to your senses, Mary. What is it the book says about men that it does not say about women?"

Wife (placidly): "It says all men are liars."

Then the husband arose and put on his hat and went out to see what kind of a night it was.—*The Independent Methodist*.

A COLLECTION FOR SOLOMON.—Dr. Mutchmore, the editor of the *Presbyterian*, has been making a journey around the world. He thus describes a form of persecution to which he was subjected: "There are some things in every life which are perplexing and inexplicable. In our tour, in nearly every church where we preached or worshipped which had a choir of some pretensions, it gave us the piece, 'Consider the Lilies,' and in song, bold and flighty, told us five or six times that Solomon was 'not arrayed.' For the first two or three times we did not consider the gravity of the matter, but finally became a little restive over Solomon's condition, when it was repeated and emphasized in moderate tones, in tenderness and in high-sounding tones, in trills, in shrieks, that 'Solomon was not arrayed,' and what was more embarrassing, the singers sometimes looked and bowed to us, as if we were to blame for it. When we reached San Francisco, we thought, this will end this Solomon business. We supposed that it was a favorite in the East because he had his bringing up there; but, to our amazement, we heard it in three churches in the Occident as well as Orient, that 'Solomon was not arrayed.' In the East there was appropriateness in it, where nobody is much arrayed. But when we heard again in Saratoga, on different occasions, that 'Solomon was not arrayed,' from four to six times right along, and in a manner that could leave no doubt, and when significant movements of the head were made at us, we felt that it was time that something should be done without fail. Let a collection be taken up for Solomon."—*The Christian Register*.

WHAT THE MAGAZINES FOR OCTOBER CONTAIN.

HARPER's opens with a poem by Lucy Larcom. Next comes a beautifully illustrated article on the "Forests of the California Coast Range," by Fred. M. Somers. "The Fair of Nijnli-Novgorod" is the subject of another article. This fair is a survival of a remote period. It is not what it used to be, is far less cosmopolitan, yet it retains some features of interest. The article on "Hierapolis and its White Terrace" carries us into Bible-land, for it deals with the territory mentioned in Coloss. 4:13. The famous White Terrace of Hierapolis would alone be worth a journey to see. It reminds one of pictures of the similar formation in New Zealand, which was destroyed by the terrible earthquake of 1887. But Hierapolis is full of archeological interest, as the text and illustrations amply prove. Passing over the poetry and the fiction and other articles of this number, we find two of religious interest—"The Building of the Church of St. Denis," by Charles Eliot Norton, and "A Peculiar People," by Howard Pyle. The former article gives us a glimpse into the very busy life of a mediæval abbot, Suger, abbot of St. Denis, and friend of Louis the Fighter, alas! to be better known as Louis the Fat. It was he who rebuilt the abbey-church. Mr. Pyle has laid us under obligation by portraying for us by pen and pencil the Duncers or Tunkers. They are indeed a peculiar people, and their neighbors, the German Seventh-day Baptists, still more so.

It seems so strange that right in the midst of the great State of Pennsylvania, so full of "modern improvements," there should exist to-day such unworlly, simple and primitive people. Yet he who would study a curious form of Christianity, with its kiss of charity, its feet washing, its separation of the sexes in worship, its voluntary celibacy, has only to go a little way from Lancaster. Prof. W. G. Blakie, D.D., writes about "A Corner of Scotland ward Knowing," and, incidentally, the game of golf. The "corner" is North Berwick. The illustrations are numerous. The Editor's Easy Chair contains one of the graceful essays Mr. Curtis knows so well how to write. This time his theme is Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge's biography of Washington. The remaining departments of this Magazine are filled as usual.

SCHUBNER's, unique among the rivals in popular favor in the United States, has no editorial department of any kind, transports us to Africa in its first article. Mr. Joseph Thomson writes "How I Crossed Masai-land." He does not encourage other persons to do it. Incidentally he raps Stanley and Bishop Hannington, "who unhappily following my footsteps, and utterly disregarding my warnings and advice, marched with incredible rashness to the fate which befell him, a few miles west of my farthest point" (p. 408). One of the illustrations is of the northeast corner of Lake Victoria Nyanza, near where Bishop Hannington was murdered. The article, "Electricity in War," illustrated, is in two parts, treating of naval and land warfare respectively. Human ingenuity has been able to do wonders of late both in the destruction and preservation of life. It is reassuring to reflect that the probability continually grows less that these terrific engines of destruction will shortly be used in actual war. Mr. Charles Sprague Smith writes on "A Summer in Iceland." "The two most distinct impressions made upon the stranger's mind during the earlier period of his sojourn are, first, the physical inertia of the ordinary Icelander, and second, his hospitality." The former is attributed to his poverty and neglect of sanitation. Leaving Reykjavik he lived with a rural dean. He gives a pleasing picture of their family life. His journey closed with a trip through its southern part. One of the illustrations, that of the Fall of the White River, deserves special mention. Mr. Edward J. Lowell gives us "The Life of Benvenuto Cellini," an illustrated article. He remarks that "as a sculptor Benvenuto still proves himself a goldsmith. The pedestal of the Perseus, with its bas-relief and its four little statues, is admirable jewelry." Mr. Donald G. Mitchell sends "A Scattering Shot at some Ruralities," and other writers give us stories and poems.

LIFECENTURY's has these contents: "Creole and Puritan," by T. C. de Leon (a complete story of 122 pp.); an appreciative article on "The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley," by S. B. Wister; "An Influence" (a poem of two verses), by John B. Tabb; "The Trials of Magazine Editors," by Junius Henri Browne (an instructive article, which should be read by the army of non-professional writers who are doing the unpardonable in print); "My Hero" is a little poem of eight lines, by Ellen Seawell; "Banquo Jean" (a quaint story of one who lived on Lake Borgne, one of the chain between Lake Pontchartrain and the Gulf of Mexico), by Maurice Thompson; "If" (a poem of four verses), by Mary Ainge de Vere; "What Shall be our National Flower?" (a vote for the golden-rod), by Anne H. Wharton. The rest of the number is made up of miscellaneous matter.

THE CENTURY.—The striking face of Molière, in stage costume, looks at us as we open the magazine, and begin reading another instalment of Mr. George Kennan's powerful but sad articles on Russia. That for the current month is on some "East-Siberian Silver Mines," worked by convicts. It makes one's blood boil to read his quiet, simple, graphic narrative. The places in which the unhappy convicts sleep and work are unutterably bad. Of one of their prisons he writes: "As a place of confinement, even for the worst class of offenders, it was a disgrace to a civilized state, and the negligence,

indifference, and incompetence shown by the Government in dealing with its admitted evils were absolutely inexorable." The poor convicts are the victims of a system of organized corruption. Mr. Kennan does not hold the Czar personally responsible for their bad treatment. Red tape and official plunder are the main causes of it. But one would think that there might be at least an effort to make things better. It is odd to come across a picture of *camels* grazing, in an article on Siberia in winter. M. C. Coquelin discourses on "Molière and Shakspeare." He has a Frenchman's proper admiration of Molière, and makes a number of discriminating remarks. "Bacchante for the Spectator," by Mr. Walter Camp, brings before us by pen and picture the joys and the dangers of the national game. Next comes an instalment of Messrs. Nicolay and Hay's life of Lincoln, taking in Blair's Mexican project, the Hampton Roads conference, and the XIIIth Amendment. The curtain will soon fall on that noble life. "In Sorrow's Hour," a poem by Lizzie Wordsworth Reese, precedes "Fra Filippo Lippi" by the competent hand of Mr. W. J. Stillman. Mr. Cole's engraving of Lippi's "The Virgin Adoring the Infant Christ," is admirable. "Three Jewish Kings," by Mr. Edward L. Wilson, relates incidents from the lives of Saul, David, and Solomon in connection with views of localities in the Holy Land. The article is particularly interesting to Bible students, and is a good specimen of the application of the Land to the Book. Mr. Henry Jerome Stockard writes some verses "Over their Graves"—not those of the three Jewish kings just mentioned. A very modest or timid person, who does not admire them, writes the tenth article on "The Pretty Girls in the West," and gives a specimen. Mr. Robert Underwood Johnson rhymes "On a Great Poet's Obscurity." Can he mean Browning? "The Longworth Mystery," by Mr. Young E. Allison, is fiction. "Compensation," by Mr. Stuart Sterne, is verse. So is "Songs of Ireland," by Jennie E. T. Dove. Mr. Maurice Thompson tells an amusing and instructive story about "Ben and Judas." Mr. William Young's verse puts "Phryne in Hades." Many think she deserved to go lower. "Maria Mitchell's Reminiscences of the Herschels" is an interesting account of a visit paid Sir John Herschel in 1857. Mr. J. C. Harris continues his story, "The Old Bascom Place." Alice Wellington Rollins, in her poem, "Sunrise," thinks that sufferers raise sweeter hymns of thanks for the dawn than those who get up to see the sun rise. "The Training of the Teacher," by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler; Mr. Francis Newton Thorpe's "Manual Training as a Factor in Modern Education," and Mr. Felix Adler's "The Democratic Ideal in Education," are three illustrated articles deserving attention. Mr. H. S. Sanford, Jr., devotes seven lines to "Illusions." Mr. G. W. Cable edits "The War Diary of a Union Woman in the South." Louise Imogen Guiney writes some verses "To a Dog's Memory." No one would imagine that they were addressed to a dog if the title did not say it. The departments, "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters" and "Bric-a-brac" take the usual range.

The Atlantic has "The Begum's Daughter," a serial story, by Edward Laseter Byrner; "A Non-combatant's War Reminiscences," by Rev. Dr. J. R. Kendrick; "The Monmouth and Newport Campaigns," by John Fiske; "Prismatics," by Sophia Kirk; "The Closing Scenes of the Iliad," by William Cranston; "Lays in the Harpura" (a poem), by Clifton Scott; "Davy's Necktie," a story by Chas. W. Chubbett; "The Government and its Creditors," by Henry Loomis Nelson; "Sunset" (poem), by Mary Colborne-Veel (the companion piece to Alice W. Rollins' "Sunrise" in the Century); "Ladies and Learning," by L. D. Morgan; "Fiction in the Pulpit" (not, as might be supposed, on the clerical use of fiction, but on the tendency of novelists these days to do some more or less superfluous preaching in their novels), by Agnes Repplier; "The Plant of the Rose" (poem), by John B. Tabb; "The Tragic Muse" (serial story), by Henry James; "Theodore Dwight Woolsey. Reminiscences," by Joseph Henry; "The Burial of the Eastern States," by "The Contributor's Club," and the "Books of the Month," are four unsigned articles. Dr. J. R. Kendrick was pastor in Charleston when the war broke out, and had therefore an excellent opportunity of seeing things from the inside, and it was well he wrote out his reminiscences. We cannot have too many such publications. This article matches that written by another non-combatant in the Century. Professor Fiske tells the good story, that when that "unmutilated brute," the British Major-General, Prescott, was being conveyed a prisoner through Connecticut, he got his dinner one day at Lebanon, in the inn of Captain Alden. On the table was put a dish, "succotash," whereupon Prescott, not knowing the delicious dish, roared out, "What do you mean by offering me this hog's food?" and threw it all upon the floor. It is satisfactory to learn that Captain Alden horsewhipped him for that performance. Mr. Lawton prints original translations of the latter books of the Iliad. Mr. Nelson writes of the delayed payment of Mr. Platt's just claim against the government, and other equally disgraceful treatment by Congress of those who had claims. L. D. Morgan writes entertainingly upon the vagaries of men in respect to the amount of learning a woman could or should carry. Professor Thayer informs us that it was Dr. Woolsey's influence as a reviser which led to the adoption of the form Quirinus instead of Quirinus in Luke ii. 2, and the translation of Matt. xxvi. 50 as it now stands in the Revised Version.

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.,

Of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City,

AND

REV. FRANK HUGH FOSTER, PH.D.,

Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

[THIS DICTIONARY WAS BEGUN IN THE OCTOBER NUMBER AND WILL BE
CONTINUED IN THE SUCCESSIVE NUMBERS, FIVE HUNDRED PAGES APPEARING
WITHIN THE YEAR.]

NEW YORK:
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY.

1889.